

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-1150

---

CHRISTOPHER BERNARD JONES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DESMINE SARDIN, President of Liberty Funding;  
PERRY S. LUTHI, SR.; LUTHI MORTGAGE COMPANY,  
INC.; CAROLINA TAX SERVICE, Carolina Tax  
Service, Incorporated; LUTHI CONSTRUCTION  
COMPANY; LIBERTY FUNDING; GENERAL FUNDING;  
PERRY S. LUTHI, JR.; MARTHA PACE; LORI MURPHY;  
CAROL A. SIMPSON; IRA HANDY; HANDY MOISTURE &  
PEST CONTROL; PETE PETERSON; RICK DOE, of  
Luthi Construction; RON PLATT; SONNY NINAN, of  
Rhino Realty; MARSHA PLATT; MICHAEL DOE; DEE  
DEE DOE; KIM DOE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. Bristow Marchant, Magistrate Judge.  
(6:06-cv-00049-PMD)

---

Submitted: August 24, 2006

Decided: August 28, 2006

---

Before KING, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher Bernard Jones, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Bernard Jones seeks to appeal an order entered by a magistrate judge denying his motions for appointment of counsel and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2000), a magistrate judge may enter a final order directly appealable to the court of appeals upon consent of all parties. Otherwise, under § 636(b), an appeal of an order entered by a magistrate judge lies with the district court. Absent an express adoption, modification, or rejection of the magistrate judge's ruling by the district court, the ruling is generally not reviewable by the court of appeals. See Reynaga v. Cammisa, 971 F.2d 414, 416-18 (9th Cir. 1992). In this case, we find nothing in the record showing that the parties agreed to have Jones' complaint decided by the magistrate judge. 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