

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1030

FELICIA SPRINCENATU PFOUTS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MEASUREMENT INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 11-1367

FELICIA SPRINCENATU PFOUTS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MEASUREMENT INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen,
Jr., District Judge. (1:09-cv-00846-WO-LPA)

Submitted: June 9, 2011

Decided: June 28, 2011

Before KEENAN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed in part; affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Felicia Sprincenatu Pfouts, Appellant Pro Se. Daniel Palmieri, K&L GATES LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Felicia Sprincenatu Pfouts seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her motion for review of the settlement agreement (No. 11-1030) and the court's judgment dismissing her employment discrimination action (No. 11-1367). We affirm in part and dismiss in part.

With regard to the order in No. 11-1030, this court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order Pfouts seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See In re Bryson, 406 F.3d 287-89 (4th Cir. 2005). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal in No. 11-1030 for lack of jurisdiction.

Turning to Pfouts's appeal of the district court's final judgment, we have reviewed the record and find no error in the district court's dismissal of the action. Accordingly, we affirm the order in No. 11-1367 for the reasons stated by the court. Pfouts v. Measurement Inc., No. 1:09-cv-00846-WO-LPA (M.D.N.C. Mar. 15, 2011). 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 IN PART; AFFIRMED IN PART