

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7444

NATHANIEL DANTE RICE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; DAYMON BYRD, Senior Officer;
OFFICER HIGHLANDER; OFFICER QUINN; OFFICER SINGLETON;
OFFICER O'BRYANT; OFFICER MCHENRY; LIEUTENANT VARGAS;
LIEUTENANT WRIGHT; LIEUTENANT CRADDOCK; LIEUTENANT MURPHY;
LIEUTENANT GERALD; UNIT MANAGER CAMACHO; ASSOCIATE WARDEN
HISCOCKS; COUNSELOR HOPKINS; COUNSEL LASSITER; COUNSELOR
DAUGHETY; COUNSEL BROOKS; PA DERRY; PA LECURIE; PA/OFFICER
CANADA; NURSE CARTER; OFFICER TORRES; OFFICER KELLER;
OFFICER ROCK; OFFICER MCGEE; OFFICER GOOLSBY; OFFICER
ANDERSONMIC; OFFICER SMITHWILL; OFFICER NEWSOME; OFFICER
SANFORD; OFFICER STATEN; OFFICER ARIAS; OFFICER GLASS;
OFFICER KLUX; OFFICER PERRY; OFFICER BULLOCK; OFFICER WOODS;
OFFICER FANUEF; MID-ATLANTIC REMEDY COORDINATOR; CENTRAL
OFFICE COORDINATOR; ADMINISTRATOR COORDINATOR, at Butner FCI
2; ADMINISTRATOR COORDINATOR, at Talladega FCI; HEALTH
SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR; ASSISTANT HEALTH SERVICES
ADMINISTRATOR KILPATRICK; REGIONAL DIRECTOR, in official
capacity; GENERAL COUNSEL, in official capacity; DIRECTOR OF
BUREAU OF PRISONS, in official capacity; FEDERAL BUREAU OF
PRISONS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle,
District Judge. (5:11-ct-03218-B0)

Submitted: December 19, 2013

Decided: December 24, 2013

Before SHEDD, DAVIS, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nathaniel Dante Rice, Appellant Pro Se. Christina Ann Kelley,
BUREAU OF PRISONS, Butner, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nathaniel Dante Rice seeks to appeal the district court's order granting his motions to amend his complaint, but dismissing the amended complaints except as to one claim. 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, 545-46 (1949). The order Rice seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED