

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-1970

MUSTAFA H. SA'ID,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

FAIRFAX COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, et al; BEST BUY, INC.; COUNTY OF FAIRFAX POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al; D. A. CROOKE, Sergeant, individually; J. THOMAS MANGER, Colonel, individually; ERIC HANTE, Officer, individually; BRIAN J. MCANDREW, Lieutenant, individually; LEON G. WILLIAMS, Major; THOMAS RYAN, Captain, individually; ARTHUR J. HURLOCK, JR., individually; THOMAS E. TYMAN, individually; CHARLES K. PETERS, Captain, individually; WILLIAMS AUDREY M. SLYMAN, Major, individually; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, et al, Workers Compensation Commissioners; SUSAN A. CUMMINS, individually,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Theresa Carroll Buchanan, Thomas Rawles Jones, Jr., and Barry R. Poretz, Magistrate Judges. (CA-01-677-A)

Submitted: September 6, 2001

Decided: September 11, 2001

Before WIDENER, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mustafa H. Sa'id, Appellant Pro Se. Ann Gouldin Killalea, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Fairfax, Virginia; Louis Edward Matthews, Jr., OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Mustafa H. Sa'id appeals the district court's orders dismissing several Defendants in this civil action, prohibiting discovery by Sa'id pending further order of the court, and directing Sa'id to appear for a hearing. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the orders are not appealable. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The orders here appealed are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders.

We dismiss the appeal as interlocutory. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED