

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 01-6548**

---

ROBERT DUNBAR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;  
HUMAN RESOURCE SERVICE; DAVIS, Doctor at  
Kirkland Reception and Evaluation Center;  
NEIVLLE, Kirkland Reception and Evaluation  
Center; CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL SERVICES (CMS);  
CORRECTIONS OFFICER ADAMS, Officer at Kirkland  
Correctional Institution; HOWARD FREEMAN  
PATTERSON; PATTERSON, Officer at Kirkland Cor-  
rectional Institution; ANTHONY, Officer at  
Kirkland Correctional Institution; BARBARA  
SKEEN, SCDC Health Resource Service; DOUG  
CATOE, Director of SCDC; PALMETTO HEALTH  
ALLIANCE, d/b/a Palmetto Richland Memorial  
Hospital,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. Patrick Michael Duffy, District  
Judge. (CA-00-619-2-23AJ)

---

Submitted: July 26, 2001

Decided: August 2, 2001

---

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Robert Dunbar, Appellant Pro Se. James E. Parham, Jr., Irmo, South Carolina; Charles Elford Carpenter, Jr., Georgia Anna Mitchell, S. Elizabeth Brosnan, RICHARDSON, PLOWDEN, CARPENTER & ROBINSON, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Robert Dunbar appeals the district court's order granting Richland Memorial Hospital's motion to dismiss and substituting parties. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the order is 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 order here appealed is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order.

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