

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6051**

---

KENDELL ALEXANDER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

D. R. STEPHENS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III,  
Chief District Judge. (5:12-hc-02146-D)

---

Submitted: June 26, 2014

Decided: July 1, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kendell Alexander, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kendell Alexander, a federal prisoner, filed a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012), raising due process claims and challenging the loss of good-time credits as a result of a disciplinary conviction. The district court rejected Alexander's claims and denied a certificate of appealability ("COA") on January 16, 2013. On March 27, 2013, at the earliest, Alexander filed a motion for a COA and a motion to extend the time to file an appeal, see Fed. R. App. P. 4, which the district court denied. The court also denied Alexander's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion.

Alexander filed a timely notice of appeal from the district court's orders denying his motions for a COA, to extend the appeal period, and for reconsideration. Because Alexander failed to challenge in his informal appellate brief the court's reasons for denying relief, he has forfeited appellate review of those orders. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (limiting review to issues raised in informal brief). Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we affirm the district court's orders.\*

---

\* In his informal brief, Alexander repeats the due process claims he raised in his § 2241 petition. To the extent he seeks to appeal the district court's order denying § 2241 relief, we do not have jurisdiction to review that order. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), (a)(5).

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