

**UNPUBLISHED**

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

---

**No. 19-2311**

---

RAJESH GUPTA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FREDDIE MAC,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:19-cv-00109-CMH-IDD)

---

Submitted: September 23, 2020

Decided: October 1, 2020

---

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Rajesh Gupta, Appellant Pro Se. Robert R. Lawrence, Associate General Counsel, FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION, McLean, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rajesh Gupta appeals the magistrate judge's order imposing sanctions and the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of Gupta's former employer, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, in Gupta's employment discrimination action brought under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 to 12213. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Gupta's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's grant of summary judgment, he 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.").

Gupta does challenge in his informal brief the magistrate judge's order imposing sanctions for Gupta's failure to comply with court orders. Gupta, however, failed to timely object in the district court to the magistrate judge's order ruling on a nondispositive pretrial matter. *See Hutchinson v. Pfeil*, 105 F.3d 562, 566 (10th Cir. 1997) ("Discovery is a nondispositive matter, and magistrate judges have the authority to order discovery sanctions."). Thus, Gupta has waived further review of the magistrate judge's order. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); *Solis v. Malkani*, 638 F.3d 269, 274 (4th Cir. 2011) (noting that failure to object to magistrate judge's determinations in either dispositive or nondispositive matters waives further review).

Accordingly, we affirm. 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*