

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1751

FRIZZELL CARRELL WOODSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 18-1752

FRIZZELL CARRELL WOODSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 18-1753

FRIZZELL CARRELL WOODSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 18-1754

FRIZZELL CARRELL WOODSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 18-1755

FRIZZELL CARRELL WOODSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, Senior District Judge. (3:18-cv-00278-HEH; 3:18-cv-00279-HEH; 3:18-cv-00280-HEH; 3:18-cv-00282-HEH; 3:18-cv-00281-HEH).

Submitted: November 15, 2018

Decided: November 19, 2018

Before MOTZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part, dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Frizzell Carrell Woodson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Frizzell Carrell Woodson appeals the district court's orders dismissing his complaints and ordering him to show cause why a prefiling injunction should not issue. With respect to the court's dismissal of Woodson's claims, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Woodson v. United States*, No. 3:18-cv-00278-HEH (E.D. Va., June 5, 2018); *Woodson v. United States*, No. 3:18-cv-00279-HEH (E.D. Va., June 5, 2018); *Woodson v. United States*, No. 3:18-cv-00280-HEH (E.D. Va., June 5, 2018); *Woodson v. United States*, No. 3:18-cv-00282-HEH (E.D. Va., June 5, 2018); *Woodson v. United States*, No. 3:18-cv-00281-HEH (E.D. Va., June 5, 2018).

To the extent Woodson seeks to appeal the show cause portion of the district court's orders, 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). This portion of the orders constitutes neither a final nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of the appeals for lack of jurisdiction.

We deny Woodson's motions for default judgment, to show cause, and to deconsolidate. 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*