

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-6115

HUGH GREGORY TURBEVILLE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NEIL LIVINGSTON, Horry County Police Officer;
BARBRA PRATT, South Carolina Bar Member, court
attorney; COREY SANDERS, Assistant Solicitor,
South Carolina Bar Member, South Carolina
Solicitor, Horry County; RALPH WILSON, South
Carolina Bar Member, South Carolina Solicitor,
Horry County; CHARLIE CONDON, South Carolina
Bar Member, South Carolina Attorney General;
GARY MAYNARD, South Carolina Department of
Corrections Director; DOUG CATOE, South
Carolina Department of Corrections Official;
JIM HODGES, Governor of South Carolina; HENRY
B. SMYTHE, South Carolina Bar President, all
personally and officially,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SIDNEY FLOYD, South Carolina Bar Member, South
Carolina Attorney General,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge.
(CA-03-3452-4)

Submitted: June 24, 2004

Decided: June 30, 2004

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hugh Gregory Turbeville, Appellant Pro Se. Robert E. Lee, AIKEN BRIDGES, Florence, South Carolina; Barbra W. Pratt, Little River, South Carolina; Elizabeth Van Doren Gray, Amy Hill, SOWELL, GRAY, STEPP, & LAFFITTE, L.L.C., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Hugh Gregory Turbeville seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss one of the ten named Defendants in Turbeville's civil 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 order Turbeville seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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