## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| -   |                       |                                       |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| _   | No. 19-1105           |                                       |
| DON W. MCKINNEY,  |                       |                                       |
| Plaintiff - App   | ellant,               |                                       |
| v.  |                       |                                       |
| COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGII<br>UNITED STATES DISTRICT CO                     |                       | URT OF WISE COUNTY;                   |
| Defendants - A  | Appellees.            |                                       |
| Appeal from the United States Dis<br>Stone Gap. James P. Jones, Distric |                       | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Submitted: May 23, 2019   |                       | Decided: May 28, 2019                 |
| -   |                       | Beerded. Way 26, 2013                 |
| Before KING and RICHARDSON  | , Circuit Judges, and | SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.          |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curia:                                      | m opinion.            |                                       |
| Don W. McKinney, Appellant Pro  | Se.                   |                                       |
| Unpublished opinions are not bindi                                      | ng precedent in this  | circuit.                              |

## PER CURIAM:

Don W. McKinney appeals the district court's orders dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2012) and imposing a prefiling injunction. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because McKinney's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, McKinney has forfeited appellate review of the court's orders. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 175 (4th Cir. 2014). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. 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**