

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 18-6633**

---

MICHAEL CATES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BALTIMORE CITY CIRCUIT COURT; JUDGE JEANNIE HONG;  
BALTIMORE CITY STATE'S ATTORNEY; LISA PHELPS, State's Attorney;  
GOVERNOR LARRY HOGAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  
Ellen L. Hollander, District Judge. (1:18-cv-01398-ELH)

---

Submitted: August 16, 2018

Decided: August 21, 2018

---

Before WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Cates, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Cates appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Cates' informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's order, Cates has forfeited appellate review of the court's judgment. *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."). To the extent that Cates seeks to raise an independent claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101-12213 (2012), the named Defendants are not amenable to such suit. *See Baird ex rel. Baird v. Rose*, 192 F.3d 462, 472 (4th Cir. 1999). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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*