

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6317

JEROME EUGENE TODD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ZACHARY J. SULLIVAN, Trial Attorney; JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General of the United States, individual and official capacities; JAMES L. ROBERT, United States District Federal Judge, individual capacity; H. JOYNER, Warden Chief Executive Officer, individual capacity; CHAD A. READLER, Assistant Attorney General, individual capacity; THOMAS R. KANE, Former Director of BOP, individual capacity; JEFFERY C. SULLIVAN, United States Attorney; ANASTASIA BARTLETT, Assistant United States Attorney, individual capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Donald C. Coggins, Jr., District Judge. (6:17-cv-02696-DCC)

Submitted: July 19, 2018

Decided: July 24, 2018

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jerome Eugene Todd, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jerome Eugene Todd appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his *Bivens* action.* On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Todd's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, Todd has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. See *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment and deny Todd's motions for bail or release pending appeal. 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

* Although the district court dismissed Todd's complaint without prejudice, we possess jurisdiction over this appeal because the district court dismissed his action for failure to comply with a court order, not on account of a flaw in the complaint. *Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc.*, 807 F.3d 619, 623 (4th Cir. 2015); *Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392*, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993).