

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-2377

REINALDO OLAVARRIA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DORETHA JONES, in her individual and private capacity; YETVETTE GRIFFIN, in her individual and private capacity; NICOLE FIELDS, in her individual and private capacity; DOREEN PEARSON, in her individual and private capacity; MANDY COHEN, in her individual and private capacity,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; ROY COOPER, Governor, in his official capacity and private capacity; REGINA PETTEWAY, in her individual and private capacity; TRACY CHAMPION, in her individual and private capacity; TARA DAWKINS, in her individual and private capacity; DELORES TAYLOR, in her individual and private capacity; THERMAN NEWTON; CHRISTINA HENDERICKS, in her individual and private capacity; JAMES A. SMITH, III, Chair of Wake County Board of Commissioners; BARBARA GIBSON, Director of North Carolina Office of State Human Resources,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:19-cv-00162-FL)

Submitted: May 20, 2021

Decided: May 24, 2021

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Reinaldo Olavarria, Appellant Pro Se. Colleen M. Crowley, NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Reinaldo Olavarria appeals the district court's order denying Olavarria's motions for recusal and to show cause and granting Defendants' motions to dismiss Olavarria's claims, brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.* On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Olavarria's informal brief fails to meaningfully challenge the district court's rationale for dismissing his claims, Olavarria has forfeited appellate review of the court's disposition. *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."). To the extent Olavarria challenges on appeal the court's decision to deny his motion for recusal, we discern no abuse of discretion. *See In re Moore*, 955 F.3d 384, 388 (4th Cir. 2020) (noting that a judge's recusal decision is reviewed on direct appeal for abuse of discretion). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Olavarria v. Jones*, No. 5:19-cv-00162-FL (E.D.N.C. Dec. 17, 2020).

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

* Although the district court dismissed Olavarria's claims without prejudice, we have jurisdiction over this appeal. *See Bing v. Brivo Sys., LLC*, 959 F.3d 605, 614-15 (4th Cir. 2020).