

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6447

SAMUEL R. JACKSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

EDDIE HART; CHARLIE HARGROVE; JOYCE COZART; GREGORY GOULDMAN;
ASCEE ANDERSON; DR. JOSEPH LIGHTSEY; PAMALA HENDERSON,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III, Chief
District Judge. (5:13-ct-03202-D)

Submitted: July 23, 2015

Decided: July 27, 2015

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

Dismissed in part, affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam
opinion.

Samuel R. Jackson, Appellant Pro Se. Donna Elizabeth Tanner, NORTH
CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Kelly
Street Brown, Elizabeth Pharr McCullough, YOUNG MOORE & HENDERSON,
PA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Samuel R. Jackson seeks to appeal the district court's orders disposing of several motions filed in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) suit. 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 district court's denial of Jackson's motion to appoint counsel and the court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Defendant Lightsey are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Jackson also appeals the district court's denial of three motions for injunctive relief. The court's order is an immediately appealable interlocutory order. 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order denying injunctive relief.

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 IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART