

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2248

PAUL SHAO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Rossie David Alston, Jr., District Judge. (1:23-cv-00809-RDA-WEF)

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 26, 2026

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Paul Shao, Appellant Pro Se. Katie M. Burnett, Meghan Golden, James Scott Humphrey, Samantha L. Marchand, BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER, COPLAN & ARNOFF, LLP, Chicago, Illinois, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Paul Shao appeals from the district court’s judgment entered after the court granted Defendant summary judgment and denied Shao partial summary judgment on Shao’s multiple civil claims. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also 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.”).

We have reviewed the record in conjunction with the issues Shao raises on appeal and find no reversible error. *See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)(2)-(3)* (“If a party fails to properly support an assertion of fact or fails to properly address another party’s assertion of fact as required by Rule 56(c), the court may . . . consider the fact undisputed for purposes of the motion [or] . . . grant summary judgment if the motion and supporting materials—including the facts considered undisputed—show that the movant is entitled to it.”); *Doe v. Pub. Citizen*, 749 F.3d 246, 269 (4th Cir. 2014) (“A corporation may possess a strong interest in preserving the confidentiality of its proprietary and trade-secret information, which in turn may justify partial sealing of court records.”)

Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s judgment. *Shao v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, No. 1:23-cv-00809-RDA-WEF (E.D. Va. Sep. 25, 2025). 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