

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2056

ALVIN L. SUTHERLIN, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LIEUTENANT J. W. SMITH; SERGEANT H. S. RICHARDSON; OFFICER
N. M. SLOVER; OFFICER M. C. PACE; OFFICER R. C. LANDRUM;
OFFICER D. C. LANCASTER; OFFICER W. C. SHIVLEY; OFFICER W.
R. MERRILL; OFFICER J. D. DIXON; OFFICER L. D. LAND,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Virginia, at Danville. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior
District Judge. (4:15-cv-00037-JLK-RSB)

Submitted: January 31, 2017

Decided: February 10, 2017

Before KEENAN and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alvin L. Sutherlin, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Maggy Lewis Gregory,
James A. L. Daniel, Tyler Brent Gammon, Martha White Medley,
DANIEL, MEDLEY & KIRBY, PC, Danville, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alvin L. Sutherlin, Jr., appeals the district court's orders denying his motions to compel, denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint, and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motions. The majority of Sutherlin's allegations of error on appeal are conclusory and fail to preserve an issue for review. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (directing appellants to present "specific issues and supporting facts and arguments" in informal brief); see also Eriline Co. S.A. v. Johnson, 440 F.3d 648, 653 n.7 (4th Cir. 2006) (finding single, conclusory sentence in brief "insufficient to raise on appeal any merits-based challenge to the district court's ruling"); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) ("Failure to comply with the specific dictates of [Rule 28] with respect to a particular claim triggers abandonment of that claim on appeal."). None of Sutherlin's allegations presents a substantial question sufficient to warrant the preparation of a transcript at Government expense under 28 U.S.C. § 753(f) (2012). See Rhodes v. Corps of Eng'rs of U.S. Army, 589 F.2d 358, 359 (8th Cir. 1978) (per curiam) (authorizing preparation of transcript at Government expense when appeal presents substantial question). Therefore, we deny Sutherlin's motion for the preparation of transcripts at Government expense.

To the extent that Sutherlin has preserved issues for appeal, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Sutherlin v. Smith, No. 4:15-cv-00037-JLK-RSB (W.D. Va. Aug. 5, Aug. 18, & Sept. 1, 2016). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED