

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-7515

JEREMIAH CHAMBERLAIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; HAROLD CLARKE; H. S.
RICHESON; A. DAVID ROBINSON; DENISE MALONE; STEVEN HERRICK;
B. MARANO; M. COUNTS; KATHRYN HARTKA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JANE DOE,

Defendant.

No. 21-7349

JEREMIAH CHAMBERLAIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; HAROLD CLARKE; H. S.
RICHESON; A. DAVID ROBINSON; DENISE MALONE; STEVEN HERRICK;
B. MARANO; M. COUNTS; KATHRYN HARTKA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JANE DOE,

Defendant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at
Roanoke. Elizabeth Kay Dillon, District Judge. (7:20-cv-00045-EKD-JCH)

Submitted: December 21, 2021

Decided: December 22, 2021

Before KING and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeremiah Chamberlain, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Jeremiah Chamberlain—a former inmate of the Virginia Department of Corrections (“VDOC”)—challenges two orders entered by the district court in his pending civil action. First, Chamberlain appeals the district court’s order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction. Second, Chamberlain seeks to appeal the district court’s order awarding summary judgment to the defendants on all but one of his claims. For the reasons explained below, we dismiss these appeals.

Beginning with the district court’s order denying preliminary injunctive relief, we observe that Chamberlain sought a preliminary injunction directing the VDOC and former or current VDOC employees to treat his medical condition in a particular manner. After Chamberlain noted his appeal from the order denying that requested relief, however, his federal habeas petition was granted, and he was released from VDOC custody. Accordingly, we dismiss as moot Chamberlain’s appeal from the district court’s order denying a preliminary injunction. *See Rendelman v. Rouse*, 569 F.3d 182, 186 (4th Cir. 2009) (“[A]s a general rule, a prisoner’s transfer or release from a particular prison moots his claims for injunctive . . . relief with respect to his incarceration there.”).

Turning to the district court’s summary judgment order, we conclude that the order is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. *See United States v. Doe*, 962 F.3d 139, 143 (4th Cir. 2020) (explaining that “we have jurisdiction only over final orders and certain interlocutory and collateral orders”). Consequently, we also dismiss Chamberlain’s appeal from that order.

We therefore dismiss these consolidated appeals. We also deny Chamberlain's motions to expedite, supplement the record, and appoint counsel or a guardian ad litem filed in No. 20-7515. 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