

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-2276

ARKALGUD N. LAKSHMINARASIMHA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES (FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION); ATTORNEY
GENERAL; OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 10-1080

ARKALGUD N. LAKSHMINARASIMHA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES (FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION); ATTORNEY
GENERAL; OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Louise W. Flanagan,
Chief District Judge. (5:09-cv-00375-FL)

Submitted: June 17, 2010

Decided: June 23, 2010

Before MOTZ and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Arkalgud N. Lakshminarasimha, Appellant Pro Se. Matthew Fesak,
Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Arkalgud N. Lakshminarasimha appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and the court's case management order directing the Government to respond to pending motions, setting a deadline for the Government's response to the complaint, and directing Lakshminarasimha to refrain from filing additional motions pending the court's review of and ruling on motions pending in his case.*

Because Lakshminarasimha's informal briefs fail to address the district court's basis for dismissing his complaint and fail to raise any arguments relevant to the court's case management order, those issues have been abandoned. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999). Accordingly, we affirm the decision of the district court. We also deny Lakshminarasimha's motions seeking emergency hearings, to seal, to amend the complaint, to expedite, to respond, for emergency reinstatement and access to

* While interlocutory when the appeal was filed, the district court's subsequent final order permits review of this order under the doctrine of cumulative finality. See Equip. Fin. Group, Inc. v. Traverse Computer Brokers, 973 F.2d 345, 347 (4th Cir. 1992).

his children, for additional time to submit an amended appellate brief, and for emergency and other relief.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED