

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2476

JUDY CURRY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WALTER W. WEIFORD, personally and in his official capacity as Prosecuting Attorney of Pocahontas County, West Virginia; ROBERT A. ALKIRE, personally and in his official capacity as Sheriff of Pocahontas County, West Virginia; DAVID A. WALTON, personally and in his official capacity as Deputy Sheriff of Pocahontas County, West Virginia; COUNTY COMMISSION OF POCAHONTAS COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA, et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 04-2479

JUDY CURRY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WALTER WEIFORD, personally and in his official capacity as Prosecuting Attorney of Pocahontas County, West Virginia; ROBERT A. ALKIRE, personally and in his official capacity as

Sheriff of Pocahontas County, West Virginia;
DAVID A. WALTON, personally and in his
official capacity as Deputy Sheriff of
Pocahontas County, West Virginia; COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS OF POCAHONTAS COUNTY, WEST
VIRGINIA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern
District of West Virginia, at Elkins. Robert E. Maxwell, Senior
District Judge. (CA-03-115-2)

Submitted: May 19, 2005

Decided: May 24, 2005

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Judy Curry, Appellant Pro Se. Duane Joseph Ruggier, II, PULLIN,
FOWLER & FLANAGAN, PLLC, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Judy Curry seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying her motion for permissive joinder, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a), and for modification of a discovery order filed in her underlying 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action. 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 Curry seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and deny Curry's pending motion to remand. We deny Curry's motion for 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