

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6875

DARREL A. WHITE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

W. JACKSON, Chaplain; FOSTER, Treatment Program Supervisor; V. ANTORN,
Health Administrator,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

J. ADAMS, Operations Officer; A. DAVID ROBINSON, Chief of Corrections
Operations; E. P. WITT, Grievance Coordinator,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Norfolk. Mark S. Davis, District Judge. (2:16-cv-00597-MSD-LRL)

Submitted: November 29, 2017

Decided: December 7, 2017

Before DUNCAN, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Darrel A. White, Appellant Pro Se. Laura Maughan, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Ramon Rodriguez, III, RAWLS LAW GROUP, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Darrel A. White appeals the district court's order* granting summary judgment in favor of Appellees in White's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *White v. Jackson*, No. 2:16-cv-00597-MSD-LRL (E.D. Va. June 28, 2017). We grant White's motion for leave to use the original record but deny his motions for appointment of counsel and for a transcript at government expense. 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

* We construe White's informal brief as also challenging the district court's December 22, 2016, and March 29, 2017, orders. While we conclude that we have jurisdiction to review those orders, *see Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 176-77 (4th Cir. 2015) (discussing compliance with Fed. R. App. P. 3), White has forfeited appellate review of the December 22 order, *see id.* at 177 (limiting appellate review to issues raised in informal brief). Further, contrary to White's apparent assertion on appeal, the March 29 order did not rule that any of his claims should be rejected for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.