UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6110

LAWRENCE JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

T. O'BRIEN, Warden; CAPTAIN WILSON; LIEUTENANT TREES; J. GILLEY, Lt.; T. TAYLOR, Corr. Officer; W. WELCH, Corr. Officer; J. BAKER, Corr. Officer; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER CRUM; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER B. SHOEMAKER; S. WHITE, C.O.; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER L. BISHOP; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER A. O'QUINN; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER T. ROBINSON; R. SMITH, C.O.; A. RUTHERFORD, RN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, Senior District Judge. (7:09-cv-00165-JCT-RSB)

Submitted: August 16, 2012 Decided: August 20, 2012

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. Rick A. Mountcastle, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Johnson appeals the jury verdict entered against him in his Bivens* action, as well as several of the district court's pre-trial and post-judgment orders. With regard to the jury verdict and the orders denying Johnson's motions for appointment of counsel, change of venue, continuance, and judgment as a matter or law or, alternatively, a new trial, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Johnson v. O'Brien, No. 7:09-cv-00165-JCT-RSB (W.D. Va. Apr. 29, 2011; June 9, 2011; June 30, 2011; Sept. 22, 2011; Oct. 17, 2011; Oct. 20, 2011; Nov. 18, 2011; Jan. 12, 2012).

Turning the court's dismissal of Johnson's remaining claims, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Johnson does not challenge on appeal the court's reasons for rejecting these claims, he has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. We therefore affirm the denial of relief.

We deny Johnson's request for counsel and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

---

* Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED