

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6541

STUART WAYNE TOMPKINS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOEL HERRON; WILLIAM HYATT; JOHN DOE PURCELL; JANE DOE BOUNDS; JANE DOE COOPER; JANE DOE MOUZON; JANE DOE CHAVIS; JOHN DOE CHAVIS; JANE DOE HARTY; JANE DOE ROYNOLDS; JANE DOE MOLLAY; JOHN DOE BELLOMY; JANE DOE LYLE; JANE DOE THOMPSON; JOHN DOE INGRAM; JOHN DOE SAMUDA; JOHN DOE FRAZIER; JOHN DOE GIRT; JOHN DOE RUSS; JOHN DOE BRUNSON; JANE DOE MONROE; JOHN DOE BACOT; JOHN DOE DANFORD; JOHN DOE HUNT; JOHN DOE CHAVIS; JOHN DOE MCNEAL; JOHN DOE JONES; JOHN DOE C. COVINGTON; JOHN DOE LOCKLEOR; KRISTIE B. STANBACK; ROBERT C. LEWIS; ALVIN WILLIAM KELLER, JR.; MARIETTA BARR; JOHN DOE QUICK; PAMELA J. LOCKLEAR; CHANDRA K. RANSON; OKOCHA FRIDAY; JOHN DOE; JANE DOE GRAHAM; JOHN DOE JONES; JANE DOE GERALD; JANE DOE K. AFFORD; JANE DOE C. BULLARL; JOHN DOE, Facility Classification Committee; JOHN DOE, Director Classification Committee; JOHN DOE ALEXANDER; JOHN DOE DIAL; JANE DOE BETHA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. Paul Trevor Sharp, Magistrate Judge. (1:11-cv-00224-UA-PTS)

Submitted: August 18, 2011

Decided: August 23, 2011

Before WILKINSON, DAVIS, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stuart Wayne Tompkins, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stuart Wayne Tompkins seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's order denying his motion for appointment of counsel and striking his first set of interrogatories and request for production of documents. 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 Tompkins 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