

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7873

STANLEY LEE MOULTRIE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

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

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-DCN-BM)

Submitted: April 23, 2015

Decided: April 28, 2015

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 text orders denying his motion to amend his complaint and denying his motion for reconsideration. 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 orders Moultrie 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED