UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7290

TREY ALEXANDER WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAPTAIN MCNUT; LT. CLARK; BROAD RIVER CORRECTIONAL; LIEBER
CORRECTIONAL; MS. BERCH, Mental Health Counselor; MS. FORD, Inmate
Grievance Coordinator; SLED; MCCORMICK CORRECTIONAL,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Greenville. Donald C. Coggins, Jr., District Judge. (6:19-cv-01006-DCC-KFM)

Submitted: May 29, 2020   Decided: June 3, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, THACKER, Circuit Judge, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Trey Alexander Williams, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Trey Alexander Williams, a South Carolina inmate, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion for injunctive relief. Although neither party questions our jurisdiction over the appeal, we "have an independent obligation to verify the existence of appellate jurisdiction." *Williamson v. Stirling*, 912 F.3d 154, 168 (4th Cir. 2018) (internal quotation marks omitted). An order denying a preliminary injunction is an immediately appealable interlocutory order. 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1) (2018). However, we lack jurisdiction to review the denial of a temporary restraining order. *Office of Pers. Mgmt. v. Am. Fed'n of Gov't Emps.*, 473 U.S. 1301, 1303-05 (1985); *Drudge v. McKernon*, 482 F.2d 1375, 1376 (4th Cir. 1973) (per curiam).

Williams' motion requested both a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction. Because a "court may issue a preliminary injunction only on notice to the adverse party," Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a)(1), and Williams did not provide any notice of the motion to the Defendants, we construe Williams' motion as requesting only a temporary restraining order. Accordingly, we dismiss Williams' 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