

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-1815

PAKUJA CRYSTAL VANG,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

VALDESE WEAVER; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, (government),

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Martin K. Reidinger, Chief District Judge. (1:24-cv-00159-MR-WCM)

Submitted: March 17, 2026

Decided: April 23, 2026

Before WYNN, HARRIS, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed as modified by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Pakuja Crystal Vang, Appellant Pro Se. Sabrina Presnell Rockoff, MCGUIRE, WOOD & BISSETTE, PA, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pakuja Crystal Vang appeals the district court's order dismissing with prejudice her pro se civil action as frivolous and malicious.¹ On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Vang's informal brief does not challenge the district court's reasons for dismissing her civil action, she 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."). And even if Vang had not forfeited appellate review of that order, we would conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Vang's civil action. *See Nagy v. FMC Butner*, 376 F.3d 252, 254-55 (4th Cir. 2004) (explaining standard of review for similar dismissal orders).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's dismissal order, *Vang v. Valdese Weaver*, No. 1:24-cv-00159-MR-WCM (W.D.N.C. July 31, 2024), as modified to reflect dismissal without prejudice as to all claims except for those against Valdese Weaver, *see King v. Rubenstein*, 825 F.3d 206, 225 (4th Cir. 2016) (recognizing that dismissal of pro se complaint generally should be without prejudice if district court did not give plaintiff opportunity to amend nor discuss why amendment would be futile).² We dispense with

¹ Vang has filed a motion to transfer this case to the Supreme Court of the United States. (ECF No. 13). We deny the motion.

² The district court found that allowing Vang to amend her claims against Valdese Weaver would be futile, but the court did not address the possibility of amendment as to Vang's remaining claims.

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 AS MODIFIED