UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7075

AUDREL JACK WATSON, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

G. BOWLES, Dr., Dentist; MS. MORELLE, Dental Assistant; UNKNOWN NURSE, #1; UNKNOWN NURSE, #2; HAROLD CLARKE, Director Virginia Dept. of Corrections; MS. GOODE, Medical Administrator; MS. HIGHTOWER, Director of Nursing; WARDEN WRIGHT, Warden-Lawrenceville Corrections Center,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:14-cv-01315-GBL-MSN)

Submitted: October 20, 2015 Decided: October 23, 2015

Before MOTZ, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part, dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Audrel Jack Watson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Audrel Jack Watson, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing some of the defendants named in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint, denying his motions to appoint counsel, to amend his complaint, and for discovery, and denying his motion for a preliminary injunction.

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 portions of the district court's orders dismissing some of the named defendants and denying Watson's motions to appoint counsel, for discovery, and to amend his complaint are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of Watson's appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

However, the denial of injunctive relief may be immediately appealed. See 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1) (2012). Our review of the record reveals no abuse of discretion by the district court in denying Watson's motion for a preliminary injunction, and we affirm the denial of injunctive relief for the reasons stated by the court. See Watson v. Clarke, No. 1:14-cv-01315-GBL-MSN (E.D. Va. filed June 2, 2015; entered June 3, 2015).

We deny Watson's motion, on appeal, to appoint counsel. We deny Watson's motion for a certificate of appealability as unnecessary. 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART
DISMISSED IN PART