UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————————

**No. 09-6324**

———————————

IRA JEROME MOORE,

             Plaintiff - Appellant,

        v.

MILDRED L. RIVERA; JOHN R. OWEN, A.W.; STEVE LABIER, Unit
Manager; BRUCE SMITH, Case Manager; CHARLES GRUBBS,
Counselor; JULIETTE MOORE, Secretary; COLLETTE NICHOLSON,
A.W.P.; MARVIN TUCKER, S.O.I, Unicor; LIZ CARLSON, Unit
Manager; ANITA V. CANO, Case Manager; TROY JOHNSON,
Lieutenant; JOHN AND JANE DOE, 1 through 100; MATTHEW B.
HAMIDULLAH; DENNIS HINDERSHOT; ESTHER SLATER; OSCAR BROOKS;
A. PAUL BROOKS; PAUL GONZALES; A. GALLETTA; STEPHEN BUCKLER;
A. WIGGINS; KEITH KNIGHT; THOM COGER, and individually,

             Defendants - Appellees.

———————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Greenville.   R. Bryan Harwell, District
Judge.  (6:08-cv-02540-RBH-WMC)

———————————

Submitted:  August 20, 2009        Decided:  August 26, 2009

———————————

Before WILKINSON and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

———————————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————————

Ira Jerome Moore, Appellant Pro Se.   Beth Drake, Assistant
United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

———————————

PER CURIAM:

Ira Jerome Moore seeks to appeal the district court's orders staying discovery and denying his motions for appointment of counsel and to disqualify the United States Attorney's Office from representing the defendants in his civil action. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The orders Moore seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED