

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7537

ROBIN Y. MCMILLAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNKNOWN DOE; DETECTIVE BLAKE E. VAUGHT; DETECTIVE T. L.
HULSE; SECOND LIEUTENANT GEORGE DAVENPORT; FAIRFAX
COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 19-7563

ROBIN Y. MCMILLAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNKNOWN DOE; DETECTIVE BLAKE E. VAUGHT; DETECTIVE T. L.
HULSE; SECOND LIEUTENANT GEORGE DAVENPORT; FAIRFAX
COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:19-cv-01269-LO-IDD)

Submitted: April 16, 2020

Decided: April 20, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robin Y. McMillan, Appellant Pro Se. Kimberly Pace Baucom, Assistant County Attorney, FAIRFAX COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robin McMillan seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Although the order is immediately appealable, *see Roberts v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 339 U.S. 844, 845 (1950) (per curiam), we dismiss the appeal in No. 19-7537 as moot because shortly after denying McMillan's in forma pauperis motion, the district court dismissed her complaint with prejudice. *See Norfolk S. Ry. Co. v. City of Alexandria*, 608 F.3d 150, 161 (4th Cir. 2010).

In No. 19-7563, McMillan challenges the district court's order dismissing her complaint. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because McMillan's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, she 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, 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.

*DISMISSED IN PART AND
AFFIRMED IN PART*