## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| ·  |                     |                          |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|
|  | No. 18-6024         |                          |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA   | ,                   |                          |
| Plaintiff - Appellee,  |                     |                          |
| v.   |                     |                          |
| STEPHEN ARTHUR ROBINETTE,  |                     |                          |
| Defendant - A  | ppellant.           |                          |
| -  |                     |                          |
| Appeal from the United States Dist<br>Greensboro. William L. Osteen,<br>01132)                     |                     |                          |
| Submitted: March 13, 2018  |                     | Decided: March 16, 2018  |
| Before NIEMEYER, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.   |                     |                          |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curia   | am opinion.         |                          |
| Stephen Arthur Robinette, Appe<br>Ramaswamy, Assistant United Sta<br>ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North C | ates Attorneys, OFF | ICE OF THE UNITED STATES |

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Stephen Arthur Robinette seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending that his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion be dismissed without prejudice. 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 Robinette seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. *See In re Bryson*, 406 F.3d 284, 288 (4th Cir. 2005); *Haney v. Addison*, 175 F.3d 1217, 1219 (10th Cir. 1999); *Aluminum Co. of Am. v. U.S. Envtl. Prot. Agency*, 663 F.2d 499, 501-02 (4th Cir. 1981). Accordingly, we 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**