

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 19-6008**

---

HUBERTO ESPINDOLA-SOTO, a/k/a Felix Hernandez,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

OFFICER ONE, unknown name, Virginia's Piedmont Regional Jail; OFFICER TWO,  
unknown name, Virginia's Piedmont Regional Jail,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

TRACY JOHNS, Warden,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at  
Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, Senior District Judge. (3:18-cv-00577-HEH-RCY)

---

Submitted: May 23, 2019

Decided: May 29, 2019

---

Before KING and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Huberto Espindola-Soto, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Huberto Espindola-Soto appeals the district court's order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b), dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint without prejudice because he failed to submit a fee collection form as ordered by the court. We have jurisdiction over this appeal because the district court dismissed Espindola-Soto's complaint for procedural reasons unrelated to the contents of his pleadings, *see Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc.*, 807 F.3d 619, 624 (4th Cir. 2015), but limit our review to the issues raised in Espindola-Soto's brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because his informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's dismissal, Espindola-Soto has forfeited appellate review of the order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014). 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*