UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2094

MICHAEL CORNELIUS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN M. MCHUGH, Secretary of the Army,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:13-cv-01018-CMC)

Submitted: May 31, 2016 Decided: June 16, 2016

Before SHEDD, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Cornelius, Appellant Pro Se. Terri Hearn Bailey, Assistant United States Attorney, Christopher Gibbs, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Cornelius appeals from the district court's entry of judgment for Defendant following a bench trial in his civil action under the Whistleblower Protection Act and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We affirm.

On appeal, Cornelius claims that the district court erred in a host of ways at trial. An appellant has the burden of including in the record on appeal a transcript of all parts of the proceedings material to the issues raised on appeal. Fed. R. App. P. 10(b); 4th Cir. R. 10(c)(1). Cornelius has not provided transcripts of relevant portions of the trial supporting his arguments of error at trial. Cornelius also fails to establish a basis to have the transcripts prepared at government expense. 28 U.S.C. § 753 (2012). By failing to produce relevant transcripts or qualify for the production of the transcripts at government expense, Cornelius has waived review of these issues. Powell v. Estelle, 959 F.2d 22, 26 (5th Cir. 1992) (per curiam), abrog'n on other grounds recog'd by Diaz v. Collins, 114 F.3d 69, 72 (5th Cir. 1997); Keller v. Prince George's Cty., 827 F.2d 952, 954 n.1 (4th Cir. 1987).

Cornelius' remaining arguments of error by the district court are made in largely conclusory fashion, without an explanation as to how or why any such errors warrant reversal of the district court's judgment. Accordingly, we deem these

issues abandoned. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (directing appealing parties to present specific arguments in an informal brief and stating that this court's review on appeal is limited to the issues raised in the informal brief); Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc., 562 F.3d 599, 607 (4th Cir. 2009) (limiting appellate review to arguments raised in the brief in accordance with predecessor to Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A)); Williams v. Giant Food Inc., 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir. 2004) (noting that appellate assertions not supported by argument are deemed abandoned).

Cornelius fails to establish any basis for overturning the district court's judgment. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment. 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