

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 25-2252**

---

DR. ISAAC BRUNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BENEDICT COLLEGE; DR. ROSLYN CLARK ARTIS; DR. JANEEN WITTY;  
DR. KIMBERLY HAYNES-STEPHENS; MRS. MARTHA SMITH; GINA  
MOORE; DR. NURIA ROJAS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Columbia. Jacquelyn Denise Austin, District Judge. (3:22-cv-03921-JDA)

---

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 26, 2026

---

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Isaac Brunson, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Kennedy Barlow, HALLIGAN MAHONEY &  
WILLIAMS, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dr. Isaac Brunson appeals from the district court’s judgment entered after the court adopted the magistrate judge’s recommendations to grant Defendants summary judgment on Brunson’s discrimination and retaliation claims, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17, and 42 U.S.C. § 1981, and to decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Brunson’s state law claims for breach of contract, wrongful termination, and defamation. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also 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.”).

We have reviewed the record in conjunction with the issues Brunson raises on appeal and find no reversible error. *See, e.g., Fry v. Rand Constr. Corp.*, 964 F.3d 239, 248 (4th Cir. 2020) (reiterating that “[i]t is the perception of the decision maker which is relevant” in determining whether discipline is justified, “not the self-assessment of the plaintiff” (internal quotation marks omitted)). *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3) (“[D]istrict courts may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a claim . . . if . . . the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction.”).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s judgment. *Brunson v. Benedict Coll.*, No. 3:22-cv-03921-JDA (D.S.C. Sep. 12, 2025). 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*