## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

|   | _                     |                        |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|
|   | No. 19-6206           |                        |
| JACQUES PAUL VILLAFANA,   |                       |                        |
| Plaintiff - App   | pellant,              |                        |
| v.  |                       |                        |
| HENRY THOMAS PADRICK, JR  | <b></b> ,             |                        |
| Defendant - A   | ppellee.              |                        |
|   | _                     |                        |
| Appeal from the United States E<br>Richmond. Roderick Charles You |                       |                        |
| Submitted: June 20, 2019  |                       | Decided: June 25, 2019 |
| Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.            |                       |                        |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curi-                                | am opinion.           |                        |
| Jacques Paul Villafana, Appellant                                 | Pro Se.               |                        |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind                                 | ing precedent in this | circuit.               |

## PER CURIAM:

Jacques Paul Villafana seeks to appeal the district court's order docketing his complaint on the condition that Villafana either prepay the filing fee or comply with procedures to proceed in forma pauperis. 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 Villafana seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny Villafana's motion to stay, 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**