

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

2008-7034

RONALD J. BELIN,

Claimant-Appellant,

v.

JAMES B. PEAKE, M.D., Secretary of Veterans Affairs,

Respondent-Appellee.

Ronald J. Belin, of Tallahassee, Florida, pro se.

Michael N. O'Connell, Trial Attorney, Commercial Litigation Branch, Civil Division, United States Department of Justice, of Washington, DC, for respondent-appellee. With him on the brief were Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Acting Assistant Attorney General; Jeanne E. Davidson, Director; and Martin F. Hockey, Jr., Assistant Director. Of counsel on the brief were Michael J. Timinski, Deputy Assistant General Counsel; and Amanda R. Blackmon, Attorney, Office of General Counsel, United States Department of Veterans Affairs, Washington, DC .

Appealed from: United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims

Judge Robert N. Davis

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

2008-7034

RONALD J. BELIN,

Claimant-Appellant,

v.

JAMES B. PEAKE, M.D., Secretary of Veterans Affairs,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims in 05-2268,
Judge Robert N. Davis.

DECIDED: April 9, 2008

Before MAYER, LOURIE and SCHALL, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Ronald J. Belin appeals the judgment of the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (“Veterans Court”), which affirmed the Board of Veterans’ Appeals decision denying entitlement of service connection for: (1) residuals of wrist injuries, (2) residuals of exposures to herbicides, and (3) “constant otic development.” Ronald J. Belin v. Gordon H. Mansfield, No. 05-2268 (Vet. App. Oct. 22, 2007). Because we lack jurisdiction, we dismiss his appeal.

Our authority to review a decision of the Veterans Court is extremely limited. We may review such a decision only to the extent that it pertains to the validity of “a rule

of law or of any statute or regulation . . . or any interpretation thereof (other than a determination as to a factual matter),” or “to interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, to the extent presented and necessary to a decision.” 38 U.S.C. §§ 7292(a), 7292(c). Unless an appeal from the Veterans Court presents a constitutional issue, we do not otherwise have jurisdiction to review either “a challenge to a factual determination” or “a challenge to a law or regulation as applied to the facts of a particular case.” 38 U.S.C. § 7292 (d)(2).

Belin sets forth many reasons why he believes the Veterans Court decision was erroneous. He does not, however, identify any error or issues pertaining to the validity or the interpretation of a rule, statute or regulation. Moreover, after an independent review of the record, we see no constitutional issues upon which jurisdiction could be predicated.

Since Belin’s appeal challenges only the Veterans Court’s application of established law concerning service connection to the facts and circumstances of his case, we have no jurisdiction to review it.