

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-7606

ROGER OSBORN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOSEPH P. SACCHET, Warden; MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES; CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL SERVICE, INCORPORATED; LLOYD WATERS, Warden; ANTHONY SWETZ, Health Services, DPSCS; JOHN STAFFORD, Doctor, Medical Director, Correctional Medical Services; ALAN GRAVES, Doctor, DDS; ROBERT TESTONI, Doctor, DDS; HARRY HEISE, Doctor, DDS; DOCTOR MOUBAREK, Physician, Correctional Medical Services; ELEANOR BOWLES, Regional Health Care Administrator; ROBERT H. MILLER, Case Management Supervisor, Retired; OLIN BRAKE, Case Management Supervisor, MCI-H,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, District Judge. (CA-00-1952-MJG)

Submitted: February 8, 2001

Decided: February 15, 2001

Before WILKINS, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Roger Osborn, Appellant Pro Se. John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Glenn William Bell, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Philip Melton Andrews, Michael Joseph Lentz, KRAMON & GRAHAM, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Roger Osborn appeals the district court's denial of his motions for summary judgment, for a criminal investigation, for appointment of counsel and other pretrial motion. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the orders Osborn seeks to appeal are not appealable. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The orders here appealed are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders.

We dismiss the appeal as interlocutory. 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