

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6519

MARION WADE FRYE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; DIRECTOR BRYAN STERLING; KENNETH NELSON; RANDY WARD; FRANKLIN MILLER; CONTRABAND CORRECTIONAL OFFICER DEGROFF; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER MADDOX; SHOLANDA JACKSON; MENTAL HEALTH OFFICER HUGHES, Governor; QUALIFIED MENTAL HEALTH PERSONNEL THOMAS; QUALIFIED MENTAL HEALTH PERSONNEL FOUTY; QUALIFIED MENTAL HEALTH PERSONNEL TOLSEN; BRUCE LOBITZ; VIOLA THORTON; NURSE MASSEY; NURSE HARRIS; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR LICENSING AND REGULATION; BOARD EXECUTIVE JESSICA BEISE; PRISMA HEALTH, Hospital; IMAGE CARE, LLC; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Department of Mental Health/Behavior Health Services; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Department of Medical Services Office; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Director of the Department of Medical Services; OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL; PRISMA HEALTH, Hospital Surgeon, Servants, License Physicians, and Employees John Does 1 - 5; IMAGE CARE, LLC, Radiologist, License Physicians, Employees, Servants, John Does 1 - 5,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Joseph Dawson, III, District Judge. (5:24-cv-01893-JD)

Submitted: November 25, 2025

Decided: December 2, 2025

Before WYNN and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marion Wade Frye, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marion Wade Frye appeals the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing Frye's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action and denying Frye's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Frye's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, he has forfeited appellate review of the court's orders. *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 Frye's motion for injunctive relief and affirm the district court's orders. 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