

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6353**

---

TRAVIS JACKSON MARRON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN JABE, Asst. Dir. of Corrections,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

JONES, C.E.O./Founder of J.E.M.,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III,  
Senior District Judge. (1:12-cv-00468-TSE-TRJ)

---

Submitted: July 30, 2014

Decided: August 26, 2014

Amended: August 28, 2014

---

Before GREGORY, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Travis Jackson Marron, Appellant Pro Se. Kate Elizabeth  
Dwyre, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond,  
Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Travis Jackson Marron appeals the district court's order denying his motion to compel discovery and granting summary judgment to John Jabe\* in Marron's action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc to 2000cc-5 (2012).

Marron did not appeal that part of the district court's order granting summary judgment on his Equal Protection claim. We therefore do not review the district court's disposition of that claim. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("limit[ing] review to the issues raised in the informal brief").

Marron argues that the district court erred in failing to hold Jabe in default. He also contends that the court erred in not considering his freedom of speech, freedom of the press, Establishment Clause, and antitrust claims. As to the antitrust claim, we note that the district court dismissed with prejudice Marron's vague claim in his original complaint based on an unlawful monopoly. We find no error in that judgment. And because Marron did not properly present the other claims in the district court, we will not review them now on appeal. Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993).

---

\* The district court dismissed a second defendant early on in the proceeding below, and Marron does not challenge this disposition on appeal.

With respect to Marron's remaining contentions, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Marron v. Jabe, No. 1:12-cv-00468-TSE-TRJ (E.D. Va. Feb. 14, 2014). 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