

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-7770

EUGENE PETER SCHULER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Director, VDOC,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:16-cv-01151-LMB-JFA)

Submitted: July 26, 2022

Decided: July 28, 2022

Before MOTZ, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eugene Peter Schuler, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eugene Peter Schuler appeals the district court's order construing his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for relief from judgment as an unauthorized, successive 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition and denying it for lack of jurisdiction.* On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Schuler'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 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

* A certificate of appealability is not required to appeal the district court's jurisdictional categorization of a Rule 60(b) motion as an unauthorized, successive habeas petition. *United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 (4th Cir. 2015).