

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7584**

---

JAMES LESTER ROUDABUSH, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THEODORE C. NELSON, SA, U.S. Department of State; JASON CALLAHAN, Detective, Prince William County Police Department; STEPHAN HUDSON, Chief, Prince William Police Department; REBECCA THATCHER, Assistant Commonwealth Attorney; JOHN/JANE DOE, Prince William County Police Department, Evidence Sect. Director; CHRIS FELDMAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (2:13-cv-00641-RBS-DEM)

---

Submitted: January 14, 2016

Decided: January 20, 2016

---

Before AGEE, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James Lester Roudabush, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Mark Anthony Exley, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Lester Roudabush, Jr., appeals from the district court's October 3, 2014, order dismissing Defendants Feldman, Thatcher, and Hudson, the court's July 7, 2015, order granting Defendant Nelson's motion for summary judgment, and the court's September 2, 2015, order denying his motion for reconsideration, granting his motion for voluntary dismissal, and dismissing his action raising claims under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012).

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Roudabush's informal brief does not proffer specific argument challenging the bases for the district court's dispositions, Roudabush has forfeited appellate review of the court's orders. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's 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