

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-6114

COREY DEANDRE HOOD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BUREAU OF PRISONS; BELLAMY, Lieutenant; WHITE, R&D Officer; WRIGHT, Corrections Officer; OWENS, Corrections Officer; MULLINS, Corrections Officer; SLONE, Corrections Officer; PARSONS, Lieutenant; LAFAVE, Lieutenant; LIVELY, Lieutenant; HANGER, Associate Warden; LIEU, Associate Warden; BRECKON, Warden; LAUREN BAILEY, Chief Psychologist; PARKER, Nurse; CAUDILL, Nurse; BROWN, Disciplinary Hearing Officer; WHITE, SHU Officer; KAREN PEASE, Nurse; HOLBROOK, Corrections Officer; SPENCER BOWMAN, Nurse; MITCHELL, Corrections Officer; OFFICER HAMILTON; OFFICER GILBERT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Michael F. Urbanski, Chief District Judge. (7:20-cv-00402-MFU-JCH)

Submitted: August 24, 2023

Decided: August 29, 2023

Before QUATTLEBAUM and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Corey DeAndre Hood, Appellant Pro Se. Krista Consiglio Frith, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Corey DeAndre Hood appeals the district court's order granting Defendants' motions to dismiss and/or for summary judgment, denying Hood's motion to amend, and dismissing Hood's complaint brought pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act and *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Hood's informal brief does not challenge the exhaustion findings that served as the basis for the district court's disposition of the majority of his claims, he has forfeited appellate review of his claims resolved on this basis. 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."). Hood also does not challenge the district court's finding that granting him leave to amend his complaint would be futile and has similarly forfeited appellate review of this ruling.

As for Hood's remaining *Bivens* claim, we have reviewed the record and discern no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Hood v. Bureau of Prisons*, No. 7:20-cv-00402 (W.D. Va. filed Jan. 20, 2023 & entered Jan. 23, 2023). 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