

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7454

HENRY W. MARTIN, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WILLIAM R. BYARS; JOHN R. PATE; ARTHUR A. JORDAN; MCKENNDLY
NEWTON; ROBERT E. WARD; JON OZMINT; DENNIS PATTERSON;
DANIEL MURPHY; DAVID M. TATARSKY; LT. J. CARUJO; LT. J.
CARTER; ROBERT ORR; LT. JAMES RUMP; CAPTAIN E. J. MILLER;
DR. THOMAS BYNSE; LT. VARLEASE BLACK; CPL L. JENKINS; CPT
MYECHA MILEY; M. HUDSON; S. SINGLATON, DHO; CPL. T.
SIMPSON; MR. MCQUEEN; P. SMITH; A. HOLLMAN; HELEN FREEMAN;
THOMAS SCOTT; CPT. E. JAMES; TANYA A. GEE; V. CLAIRE ALLEN;
JOHN C. FEW; WAYNE C. MCCABE; JILL BEATTIE; JEANNETTE MACK;
FRANCINE BAUCHMAN; PATTY BRITT POSEY; JAMES S. SLIGH, JR.;
DR. ROWLAND; GREGORY S. LINE; CHARLOTTE SMITH; ELLEN
GOODWIN; RUSSELL RUSH; JIM CROSBY; SUSAN BARDEN; VIRGINIA
CROCKER; PAM SMITH; LAKETA DIKA; DEBORAH B. DURDEN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Greenville. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge.
(6:13-cv-03516-TMC-KFM)

Submitted: January 15, 2015

Decided: January 21, 2015

Before WILKINSON and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Henry W. Martin, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Mary Elizabeth Sharp,
GRIFFITH, SADLER & SHARP, PA, Beaufort, South Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Henry W. Martin, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing Martin's claims against all but one Defendant without prejudice. 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 Martin 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