

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-6846**

---

ANTHONY DOVE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

THE CITY OF KINSTON; KINSTON FIRE DEPARTMENT;  
KINSTON HUMAN RESOURCES/PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT;  
GREGORY SMITH, Fire Chief; KARL L. MUNSON,  
Human Resource Director; COUNTY OF LENOIR,  
NORTH CAROLINA; LENOIR COUNTY SHERIFF  
DEPARTMENT; LENOIR COUNTY JAIL; BILLY SMITH,  
Lenoir County Sheriff; ARCHIE BRUITON, Lenoir  
County Head Jailer; BRANSON VICKORY, District  
Attorney for District 8; IMELDA PATE, District  
Attorney for District 8A,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Malcolm J. Howard,  
District Judge. (CA-02-34-4-H)

---

Submitted: October 9, 2002

Decided: December 3, 2002

---

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony Dove, Appellant Pro Se. Mark Allen Davis, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Gerald Patrick Murphy, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Dove appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil rights complaint as to the Lenoir County Defendants. The remaining aspects of the case are still pending before the district court. This court's jurisdiction to review cases is limited to those matters involving final decisions of the district court and certain specified interlocutory orders. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1291, 1292 (2000). Dove's appeal does not involve a final order of the district court, nor does it involve an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal as interlocutory.

Dove has also moved for sanctions against Appellees and questioned the timeliness of Appellees' responsive brief. We have reviewed each of these motions and find that they do not merit relief. Accordingly, we deny them both.

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