## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

## No. 07-1858

MICHAEL L. BUESGENS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

## versus

CHRISTINE C. FREELAND; RIVERSTONE OPERATING COMPANY, INCORPORATED; RIVERSTONE RESIDENTIAL, SC, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; CONSOLIDATED AMERICAN SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge. (8:07-cv-02092-DKC)

Submitted: January 17, 2008 Decided: January 22, 2008

Before TRAXLER, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part; affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael L. Buesgens, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael L. Buesgens appeals from the district court's order transferring his pending 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action from the District of Maryland to the Western District of Texas and entering a prefiling injunction. To the extent that Buesgens appeals the transfer of his case, this court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2000), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2000); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); <u>Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan</u> <u>Corp.</u>, 337 U.S. 541 (1949). It is well-settled that transfers under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (2000) are not appealable final orders. <u>See In re Carefirst of Md., Inc.</u>, 305 F.3d 253, 262 (4th Cir. 2002); <u>Gower v. Lehman</u>, 799 F.2d 925, 927 (4th Cir. 1986). We therefore lack jurisdiction to entertain the appeal of the transfer of Buesgens' action.

To the extent Buesgens appeals the imposition of the prefiling injunction, our review of the record discloses no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm this portion of the order for the reasons stated by the district court. <u>Buesgens v.</u> <u>Freeland</u>, No. 8:07-cv-02092-DKC (D. Md. Aug. 17, 2007). We deny Buesgens' motion to certify state court judgments and dispense with

- 2 -

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 IN PART; AFFIRMED IN PART