

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 25-6038

JOHN ROOSEVELT BACCUS, family members, attorneys, judges and other protestors of, or involved in commitment orders of #2000 GS 33 004, to the general public as “Plaintiffs,”

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE UNIFIED CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS, team of legal leaders, officers of court, and prisoners records; ALAN M. WILSON, South Carolina Attorney General’s Office; CHARLIE M. CONDON, South Carolina Attorney General’s Office; JEAN HOEFER TOAL, the South Carolina Chief Justice; EDGAR L. CLEMENTS, III, the 12th Circuit Solicitor; JUDGE JAMES E. BROGDON, JR., the 12th Circuit Judge; VON DEAN TURBEVILLE, investigator; BARRY PROSSER, Florence County Sheriff’s Department; DONALD BEATTY, the South Carolina Chief Justice; MICHAEL J. NETTLES, the 12th Circuit Judge; PAUL MICHAEL BURCH, the 12th Circuit Judge; WILLIAM P. KEESLEY, the 12th Circuit Judge; JOCELYN T. NEWMAN, the 12th Circuit Judge; TURBEVILLE COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT; MARION COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT; JOHN BLACK, South Carolina Law Enforcement Division; BRIAN WALLACE, Marion County Sheriff’s Department; ELIZABETH FRANKLIN-BEST, Esq., Attorney at Law; JUDGE DAVID C. NORTON; MAGISTRATE JUDGE BRISTOW MARCHANT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.
David C. Norton, District Judge. (9:24-cv-03745-DCN)

Submitted: August 21, 2025

Decided: August 26, 2025

Before WILKINSON, HARRIS, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Roosevelt Baccus, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Roosevelt Baccus appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) complaint for failure to state a claim. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Baccus's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition that he failed to state a claim, he has forfeited appellate review of the court's judgment. *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 Baccus's motions: to file an amicus brief, compel production of a videotape, for production of a transcript at the Government's expense, for judicial notice of his motions, and to appoint counsel; to enforce his civil rights; raising restrictive covenants and public outcry concerns; requesting an emergency conference hearing; and affirm the district court's order. 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