

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1183

ALEXANDER N. ASANOV, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION;
BELINDA KELLER SUKEENA; TANYA A. PLEKAN; JULIE L. BELL;
RHONDA G. YOUNG; OLGA S. ASANOV; OLENA M. KRAVETS; ROBERT P.
TAYLOR; MICHAEL J. HOKENBERG; JOE DOE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. Richard E. Myers, II, Chief District Judge. (5:24-cv-00082-M-KS)

Submitted: August 21, 2025

Decided: August 25, 2025

Before WILKINSON, HARRIS, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alexander N. Asanov, Appellant Pro Se. Tamika Lynn Henderson, Assistant Attorney
General, Elizabeth Curran O'Brien, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Raleigh, North Carolina; Robert S. Shields, Jr., RHD LEGAL, Raleigh, North Carolina;
Neal Andrew Ramee, THARRINGTON SMITH LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alexander N. Asanov appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his complaint; denying his pending motions; and imposing a prefiling injunction. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Asanov'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 deny Asanov's motion to appoint counsel and an interpreter and affirm the district court's order. *Asanov v. FBI*, No. 5:24-cv-00082-M-KS (E.D.N.C. Feb. 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