

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-7794

AHMAD CLARENCE GARLAND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM D. CATOE, Director, SCDC; C. RUSHTON,
Warden, McCormick Correctional Institution; L.
CARTLEDGE, Associate Warden, MCCI, C. KENDALL,
Associate Warden, MCCI; S. LEWIS, Major, MCCI;
I. CULBREATH, IGC, MCCI; GEORGE LONG, MCCI; J.
REED, MCCI; RICHARD P. STROKES; PHILIP MORRIS,
USA,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 01-6091

AHMAD CLARENCE GARLAND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAM D. CATOE, Director, SCDC; C. RUSHTON,
Warden, McCormick Correctional Institution; L.
CARTLEDGE, Associate Warden, MCCI; C. KENDALL,
Associate Warden, MCCI; S. LEWIS, Major, MCCI;
I. CULBREATH, IGC, MCCI; GEORGE LONG, MCCI; J.
REED, MCCI; RICHARD P. STROKES; PHILIP MORRIS,
USA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Dennis W. Shedd, District Judge; Terry L. Wooten, Magistrate Judge. (CA-00-3024-4-19BF)

Submitted: March 22, 2001

Decided: March 29, 2001

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ahmad Clarence Garland, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Michael Pruitt, MCDONALD, PATRICK, TINSLEY, BAGGETT & POSTON, Greenwood, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Ahmad Clarence Garland filed a civil action against Defendants alleging that they violated Garland's civil rights. Garland now appeals the district court's order clarifying its intent to dismiss only Phillip Morris as a Defendant in the action (Appeal No. 00-7794), and a separate order by the magistrate judge denying Garland's motion for the appointment of counsel (Appeal No. 01-6091). We dismiss these consolidated appeals for lack of jurisdiction because the subject orders 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 therefore grant Appellees' motion to dismiss in Appeal No. 01-6091, and we dismiss these appeals 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