

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7390

SYLVESTER E. HARDING, III,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAPTAIN R. ROUSH; LIEUTENANT D. BULLARD; CLAYTON RICHARD,
U. S. Supreme Court; OFFICER A. BROWN; BILLY WEST,
Cumberland County District Attorney; ROBBIE DICK; CLAIRE
HILL,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan,
District Judge. (5:12-ct-03136-FL)

Submitted: November 21, 2013 Decided: November 26, 2013

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sylvester E. Harding, III, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sylvester E. Harding, III, appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action without prejudice* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) (2012) for failure to state a claim, and its order denying his motion for reconsideration and various related post-judgment motions. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Harding's informal brief does not challenge the bases for the district court's dispositions, Harding has forfeited appellate review of the court's orders. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment and post-judgment order. 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

* Based on the district judge's opinion, we conclude that the dismissal was without prejudice, despite a statement to the contrary in the court's text order denying reconsideration. Although dismissals without prejudice generally are interlocutory and not appealable, here the court's order of dismissal is a final one, as the grounds for dismissal indicate that Harding could not "save his action by merely amending his complaint." Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993).