

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-1858**

---

MICHAEL L. BUESGENS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CHRISTINE C. FREELAND; RIVERSTONE OPERATING  
COMPANY, INCORPORATED; RIVERSTONE RESIDENTIAL,  
SC, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; CONSOLIDATED  
AMERICAN SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge.  
(8:07-cv-02092-DKC)

---

Submitted: January 17, 2008

Decided: January 22, 2008

---

Before TRAXLER, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed in part; affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam  
opinion.

---

Michael L. Buesgens, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael L. Buesgens appeals from the district court's order transferring his pending 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action from the District of Maryland to the Western District of Texas and entering a prefiling injunction. To the extent that Buesgens appeals the transfer of his case, 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). It is well-settled that transfers under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (2000) are not appealable final orders. See In re Carefirst of Md., Inc., 305 F.3d 253, 262 (4th Cir. 2002); Gower v. Lehman, 799 F.2d 925, 927 (4th Cir. 1986). We therefore lack jurisdiction to entertain the appeal of the transfer of Buesgens' action.

To the extent Buesgens appeals the imposition of the prefiling injunction, our review of the record discloses no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm this portion of the order for the reasons stated by the district court. Buesgens v. Freeland, No. 8:07-cv-02092-DKC (D. Md. Aug. 17, 2007). We deny Buesgens' motion to certify state court judgments and 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 IN PART; AFFIRMED IN PART