

UNPUBLISHED

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

No. 19-1047

LORETTA J. ALFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TINA BALLARD, Executive Director & Chief Executive Officer; KIMBERLY ZEICH, Deputy Executive Director & Chief Operating; AMY JENSEN, Director of Compliance; SCOTT ANDERSON, Regional Administrator of GSA National; HONORABLE JEREMIAH CASSIDY, Chief Administrative Judge; MINDY WEINSTEIN, Acting Director, EEOC; KERMIT JONES; LOUIS BARTALOT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:18-cv-00917-LMB-MSN)

Submitted: April 4, 2019

Decided: April 10, 2019

Before NIEMEYER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed as modified by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Loretta J. Alford, Appellant Pro Se. Rebecca Sara Levenson, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Loretta J. Alford appeals the district court's order dismissing with prejudice her civil action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and, alternatively, for failure to state a claim. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Alford's informal brief does not challenge the bases for the district court's disposition, Alford 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, to the extent the district court dismissed Alford's claims for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, we affirm the judgment as modified to reflect that the dismissal is without prejudice. *See S. Walk at Broadlands Homeowner's Ass'n v. OpenBand at Broadlands, LLC*, 713 F.3d 175, 185 (4th Cir. 2013) ("A dismissal for . . . [a] defect in subject matter jurisdiction[] must be one without prejudice, because a court that lacks jurisdiction has no power to adjudicate and dispose of a claim on the merits."). We further deny Alford's motion to appoint counsel. 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 AS MODIFIED