

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1743

KATHY REAVES, a/k/a Kathy Juanita Reaves,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHARLES M. DICKENS, individually; HENRY DARGAN MCMASTER; CORDERO FOSTER, individually; DANIEL HUCKSO, individually; RICHARD ROUNDTREE; WENDY EDWARDS, individually; JAMIE WILSON, JR.; XERNONA THOMAS; MAKEBA CLARK, individually; SELENA BLAKENSHIP; BRIAN KEMP; CHRISTOPHER N. WILLIAMSON; JONATHAN NELL, individually; MARK KEEL, individually; SCOTT WILKERSON, individually; REGINA CROOLEY, individually; KEVIN A. SHWEDO, individually; ROBERT G. WOODS, IV; KEVIN THOMAS; J. RON MUNNERLYN, individually; LARRY MCNEILL, individually; PATRICK DEAN BLANCHARD, individually; OFFICER SUTTON, individually; ODIE DONALD, II, individually; HARDIE DAVIS, JR., individually; VICTOR REYNOLDS, individually; JOHN MELVIN, individually; MORCEASE BEASLEY, individually; THOMAS Y. TRAWICK, JR., individually; DANIEL POSTELL, individually; LAKESHIA JORDAN, individually; MARK SIZEMORE, individually; DEXTER FISHER, individually; CHRISTOPHER A. WRAY, individually; MOLLY SPEARMAN; CATHY HAZELWOOD; KATHRYN M. CREWS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (4:22-cv-00318-TLW-TER)

Submitted: October 18, 2022

Decided: October 20, 2022

Before WYNN and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kathy Reaves, Appellant Pro Se. Jerome Scott Kozacki, WILLCOX BUYCK & WILLIAMS, PA, Florence, South Carolina; Samuel F. Arthur, III, AIKEN, BRIDGES, ELLIOTT, TYLER & SALEEBY, PA, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kathy Reaves seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and partially dismissing Reaves' amended complaint. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order Reaves seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. *See Porter v. Zook*, 803 F.3d 694, 696 (4th Cir. 2015) ("Ordinarily, a district court order is not final until it has resolved all claims as to all parties." (cleaned up)). 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