

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-1213

PETER JAMES SOVULA,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: July 16, 2026

Decided: July 21, 2026

Before WILKINSON, RICHARDSON, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Peter James Sovula, Petitioner Pro Se. Spencer Stephen Shucard, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Peter James Sovula, a native and citizen of Sierra Leone, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's decision (a) denying Sovula's application for cancellation of removal as a matter of discretion; (b) finding Sovula ineligible for asylum and withholding of removal; and (c) denying Sovula's application for deferral of removal under the Convention Against Torture. We deny the petition for review.

We have reviewed the administrative record, including the transcript of the merits hearing and all supporting evidence, and considered the parties' informal briefs. We observe that, while Sovula had representation in the underlying agency proceedings, he now proceeds pro se, and his filings in this court—even when liberally construed—fail to challenge, or meaningfully address, the agency's dispositive rulings. We thus hold that Sovula has forfeited appellate review of the adverse agency rulings, *see Ullah v. Garland*, 72 F.4th 597, 602 (4th Cir. 2023) (explaining that a party forfeits appellate review of those issues and claims not raised in the party's briefs), and that no miscarriage of justice will result from our application of the forfeiture rule here, *see Suarez-Valenzuela v. Holder*, 714 F.3d 241, 248-49 (4th Cir. 2013).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. *See In re Sovula* (B.I.A. Feb. 18, 2026). 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.

PETITION DENIED