

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-6610

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ASHLEY KAWCZYNSKI,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at
Charleston. Thomas E. Johnston, District Judge. (2:22-cr-00160-1)

Submitted: October 22, 2024

Decided: October 25, 2024

Before KING and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ashley Kawczynski, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ashley Kawczynski filed a notice of appeal, suggesting that she intended to appeal the magistrate judge's recommendation related to her then-pending 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, as well as the district court's order denying Kawczynski's motion for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The magistrate judge's report and recommendation is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. *See Haney v. Addison*, 175 F.3d 1217, 1219 (10th Cir. 1999). Accordingly, we dismiss that portion of the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Turning to the district court's denial of Kawczynski's motion for a sentence reduction, we confine our review on appeal to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Kawczynski's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, she 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 order. *United States v. Kawczynski*, No. 2:22-cr-00160-1 (S.D. W. Va. June 3, 2024). 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.

*DISMISSED IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*