

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 19-1517**

---

CORPORAL DERRECK CLAGETT, #3163,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NAJA TALIBAH ZAHIR, a/k/a Naja Zahir El,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 19-1518**

---

STATE OF MARYLAND,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NAJA TALIBAH ZAHIR,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 19-1519**

---

STATE OF MARYLAND,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NAJA TALIBAH ZAHIR,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore and Greenbelt. Paula Xinis, District Judge. (8:19-cv-01252-PX; 1:19-cv-01253-PX; 8:19-cv-01254-PX)

---

Submitted: July 18, 2019

Decided: July 22, 2019

---

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Naja Talibah Zahir, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Naja T. Zahir appeals the district court's order denying her requests to remove state criminal and traffic charges to federal court and denying her requests for an emergency injunction. "Generally, a district court's order remanding a removed case to a state court is not appealable." *Dominion Energy, Inc. v. City of Warren Police & Fire Ret. Sys.*, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, \_\_\_, No. 18-1844, 2019 WL 2707584, at \*4 (4th Cir. June 28, 2019) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) (2012)). And on appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's briefs. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Zahir's informal briefs do not challenge the district court's dispositive rulings regarding her claims for injunctive relief, Zahir has forfeited appellate review of that portion 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 dismiss the appeal as to the remand claims and affirm the district court's judgment as to the injunction claims. 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.

*DISMISSED IN PART,  
AFFIRMED IN PART*