UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6159

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOSE JESUS MORA, a/k/a Jose Mora, a/k/a Jose Jesus
Nuesslein, a/k/a Jose Jesus Neusslein,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District
Judge. (2:07-cr-00062-RAJ-JEB-1)

Submitted: May 30, 2013   Decided: June 5, 2013

Before SHEDD, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam
opinion.

Jose Jesus Mora, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen Westley Haynie,
Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jose Jesus Mora appeals the district court's orders denying his most recent motions seeking modification of the conditions of his supervised release and has filed a self-styled petition for writ of habeas corpus with this court. Mora has also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis and asks that he be appointed counsel. We have reviewed the district court record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, although we grant Mora's application to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny his request for appointment of counsel and affirm the district court's orders. See United States v. Mora, No. 2:07-cr-00062-RAJ-JEB-1 (E.D. Va. filed Jan. 7, 2013, entered Jan. 8, 2013; filed Jan. 7, 2013, entered May 13, 2013; Jan. 30, 2013).

In addition, this court ordinarily declines to entertain original habeas petitions filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2006), and this case provides no reason to depart from the general rule. Moreover, we find that the interests of justice would not be served by transferring the case to the district court. See 28 U.S.C. § 1631 (2006); Fed. R. App. P. 22(a). Accordingly, we dismiss the petition. 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.

<div align="right">
AFFIRMED IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART
</div>