

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 96-7714

---

DUKE E. WOODLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CARL R. PEED, Sheriff,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

CITY OF FAIRFAX; ARCHIVES DIVISION, Fairfax  
County Jail,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-  
trict of Virginia, at Richmond. David G. Lowe, Magistrate Judge.  
(CA-95-368-R)

---

Submitted: March 27, 1997

Decided: April 4, 1997

---

Before RUSSELL, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Duke E. Woodley, Appellant Pro Se. John J. Brandt, Robert S.  
Corish, SLENKER, BRANDT, JENNINGS & JOHNSTON, Merrifield, Virginia,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant filed a notice of appeal from a magistrate judge's order denying his motion for appointment of counsel. At the time Appellant filed the notice of appeal it was interlocutory, but this court now has jurisdiction over the appeal under the doctrine of cumulative finality because all of Appellant's claims have been dismissed. See Equipment Fin. Group, Inc. v. Traverse Computer Brokers, 973 F.2d 345, 347 (4th Cir. 1992). Because Appellant failed to raise the issue concerning the denial of his motion for appointment of counsel in an informal brief, we decline to consider the issue further. Consequently, we affirm.\* 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.

AFFIRMED

---

\* We deny Appellant's motion to file an amended complaint.