

**UNPUBLISHED**

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

---

**No. 24-1151**

---

KEVIN MICHAEL JONES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LELAND C. DUDEK, Acting Commissioner of Social Security Administration,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at  
Alexandria. Patricia Tolliver Giles, District Judge. (1:23-cv-01033-PTG-JFA)

---

Submitted: December 20, 2024

Decided: April 10, 2025

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kevin Michael Jones, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Michael Jones appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction the amended complaint Jones filed in the underlying civil action, brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), against the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Jones' informal brief does not challenge either aspect of the district court's dispositive jurisdictional ruling, or the court's denial of Jones' motions to amend his complaint, we conclude that he has forfeited appellate review of the appealed-from dismissal 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."). We deny the pending motions to amend the case caption, to access the original record, for affirmative relief, to correct and supplement the record, for a new trial, for joinder, and for partial summary judgment, and further deny as moot the pending motions to hold this case in abeyance and to consolidate this appeal with a case in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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*