

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7123**

---

STANLEY LEE MOULTRIE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WILLIAM BYARS, JR., South Carolina Department of Corrections Director; BRYAN P. STIRLING; GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY; ATTORNEY GENERAL ALAN WILSON; DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBERT WARD; SCDC GENERAL COUNSEL DAYNE HAILE; CHRISTOPHER FLORIAN; ANN HALLMAN, Agency Grievance Coordinator; MARIA LEGGINS, Agency Mailroom Coordinator; WILLIE EAGLETON, Evan Warden; ASSOCIATE WARDEN MCFADDEN; MAJOR C. WEST; BETHEA LIEUTENANT MICHAEL TOMS; MS. BAKER, Mailroom Coordinator; MS. GRAVES, ECI Grievance Coordinator; PAMELA MCDOWELL, Mailroom Supervisor; LIEUTENANT JAMES MARTIN; SERGEANT H. SIMS; ASSOCIATE WARDEN BUSH, Lee CI; ASSOCIATE WARDEN NOLAN; ASSOCIATE WARDEN DEAN; K. RIVERS, Lee CI Grievance Coordinator; JIMMY SLEIGH; DEPUTY WARDEN; LIEUTENANT JACK BROWN; CECIL WILSON; MS. CONYERS, Lee CI Officer; GENERAL COUNSEL TATARSKY; DEPUTY DIRECTOR MCCALL,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Bristow Marchant, Magistrate Judge. (9:14-cv-01690-JFA-BM)

---

Submitted: November 20, 2014

Decided: November 25, 2014

---

Before KING and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stanley Lee Moultrie, Appellant Pro Se. Jerome Scott Kozacki,  
WILCOX BUYCK & WILLIAMS, PA, Florence, South Carolina, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stanley Lee Moultrie seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's order denying Moultrie's motion to alter or amend the text order denying his request for a default judgment. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order Moultrie 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