

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-1806**

---

JOHN S. STRITZINGER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN STRATTON, Verizon Business; CHRISTIANA CARE; JAMES CLAPPER, NSC; DIANA GOWEN, Centurylink; SUSAN ZELENIAK, Verizon Gov; JOHN SPEARS, ATT; LOCKHEED MARTIN, PC; NORTHROP GRUMMAN; JACK GALLANT, U of California Berkeley; TERENCE MCAULIFFE, Governor Commonwealth of Virginia; SENTARA HEALTHCARE; JOSEPH BIDEN, Vice President of the United States; WILMERHALE, Brian Boyton, Verizon Outside Counsel; JAMES R. STRITZINGER, SR.; JACK MARKELL, Governor of Delaware; LEWIS; DAVID A. STRITZINGER; PA STATE POLICE; WILLIAM R. STRITZINGER; MD TRANSIT AUTHORITY; VA STATE POLICE; LOUIS FREEH; JAMES R. STRITZINGER, JR.; TX STATE POLICE; VERNON H. C. WRIGHT; FL STATE POLICE; FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS; MD STATE POLICE; DE STATE POLICE; MR. MILCH,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Paige Jones Gossett, Magistrate Judge. (3:15-cv-03211-TLW-PJG)

---

Submitted: November 22, 2016

Decided: November 29, 2016

---

Before DIAZ and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John S. Stritzinger, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John S. Stritzinger seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's order denying his motion to reopen his case. 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 Stritzinger seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (2012). Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny Stritzinger's pending motions, and 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