Doc. 405677301

Steven Johnson v. The State of North Carolina Appeal: 15-1271 Doc: 33 Filed: 10/22/2015 Pg: 1 of 2

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1271

STEVEN-GLENN: JOHNSON and STEVEN GLENN JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; FEDERAL RESERVE, And all those similarly situated,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (4:14-cv-00050-FL)

Submitted: October 20, 2015 Decided: October 22, 2015

Before MOTZ, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Steven Glenn Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. Olga Eugenia Vysotskaya de Brito, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee. Matthew Fesak, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Defendants.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Steven Glenn Johnson seeks to appeal the district court's order granting North Carolina's motion to set aside entry of default judgment and denying his ancillary motions and the court's text order denying Johnson's motion to alter or amend the judgment and his companion motion. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). 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 Johnson seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we deny Johnson's pending motions to reconsider designation of the parties, to reset the appellate timetable, and to abate the appeal; deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis; and dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. dispense with oral argument because the facts and contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED