

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-7799

O. GARRY OKPALA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United States; KATHLEEN HAWK SAWYER, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons; STEVEN J. GAL, Warden of the Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; JOE SNODDY, Associate Warden, Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; BYRNE, Captain of the Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; GRUBBS, Counselor at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; CARTHWRIGHT, Unit Manager at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; RANEW, Corrections Officer at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; ROBINSON, Corrections Officer at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; JOHNSON, Corrections Officer at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; KATHLEEN MACK, Supervisor of Education at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; FOSSE, Lieutenant at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, SC; ADDUCCI, Disciplinary Hearing Officer DHO at Federal Correctional Institution, Estill, South Carolina; UNKNOWN NAMED OFFICIALS, of the Federal Bureau of Prisons; FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS; USA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (CA-01-4252-0-25BD)

Submitted: March 19, 2003

Decided: April 17, 2003

Before WILLIAMS and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

O. Garry Okpala, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

O. Garry Okpala seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss some claims and defendants from his civil rights action and the court's order denying his motion filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2000), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders. 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2000); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The orders Okpala seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED