

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-7167

MICHAEL DWAYNE ROGERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHRIS RICH; JUDGE BETTY BROWN,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY; ERIC HOOKS;
WENDELL JACKSON,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at
Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (1:19-cv-00417-WO-JLW)

Submitted: February 29, 2024

Decided: March 22, 2024

Before GREGORY, AGEE, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Dwayne Rogers, Appellant Pro Se. James Trachtman, Assistant Attorney General,
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for

Appellee.



Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Dwayne Rogers, a North Carolina inmate, commenced this action alleging violations of his rights under the First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc to 2000cc-5. On the magistrate judge's recommendation, the district court granted summary judgment to Defendants Chris Rich and Betty Brown. Rogers appeals.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Although Rogers' informal brief disputes the district court's determination that Rogers' right to practice his religion was not substantially burdened, the informal brief does not meaningfully challenge the court's conclusion that the prison policies at issue were the least restrictive means of furthering a compelling governmental interest. *See Greenhill v. Clarke*, 944 F.3d 243, 250 (4th Cir. 2019) (stating elements of RLUIPA claim). As a result, Rogers 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.

AFFIRMED