

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-6964

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GREGORY K. CLINTON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Martinsburg. Gina M. Groh, District Judge. (3:17-cr-00005-GMG-RWT-1)

Submitted: November 22, 2022

Decided: November 29, 2022

Before HARRIS and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gregory K. Clinton, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory K. Clinton appeals the district court’s August 9, 2022, order denying, pursuant to a prior prefiling injunction, his “Motion to Correct Disposition Text” and “Motion to Dismiss Counts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and Release from Custody.” On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Clinton’s informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court’s disposition, he has forfeited appellate review of the court’s order.* *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) (“The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief.”). Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s judgment. We deny Clinton’s motion for appointment of counsel. 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

* We reject Clinton’s conclusory and unsupported allegations of judicial bias. *See Akins v. Knight*, 863 F.3d 1084, 1087-88 (8th Cir. 2017) (holding that plaintiff’s judicial complaint did not require presiding judge’s recusal); *Belue v. Leventhal*, 640 F.3d 567, 573 (4th Cir. 2011) (“[J]udicial rulings and opinions formed by the judge on the basis of facts introduced or events occurring in the course of the current proceedings, or of prior proceedings almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion.” (internal quotation marks omitted)); *United States v. Cherry*, 330 F.3d 658, 665 (4th Cir. 2003) (explaining that “unsupported, irrational or highly tenuous speculation” is insufficient to support partiality claim (internal quotation marks omitted)).