

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1202

DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

LIONEL MEADOWS; ALBERT L. MEADOWS; FURNEY
MUNDINE,

Plaintiffs,

versus

TOWN OF TRENTON, NORTH CAROLINA; JOFFREE T.
LEGGETT, Town Mayor; EDWARD EUBANKS; WILLARD
O. LEWIS; CHARLES JONES, Councilman of the
Town of Trenton, North Carolina; C. GLENN
SPIVEY, Town Clerk; MC DAVID AND ASSOCIATES;
RICHARD MOORE, Engineer for the Town of
Trenton, North Carolina; STATE OF NORTH CARO-
LINA, and its entities; BILL MEYERS, Director,
North Carolina Department of Environmental
Health and Natural Resources; DEXTER MATTHEWS,
Chief, Division of Solid Waste; J. BOBBY
BLOWE, Chief, Construction Grants; JAMES C.
KEARNEY, Director, Rural Economic and Communi-
ty Development; JOHN H. HANKINSON, JR., Direc-
tor, United States Environmental Protection
Agency, Region IV; MARIO MACHADO, Chief, Con-
struction Grants, their successors and agents;
EDWIN W. CAUSEY, as Rural Development Manager;
WILLARD R. DEAN, as Director of Business and
Utilities Division; JANET RENO, Attorney
General of the United States; JANICE M. COLE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Malcolm J. Howard, District Judge. (CA-96-6-H-2-4)

Submitted: May 28, 1999

Decided: June 18, 1999

Before MURNAGHAN and ERVIN, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daniel Johnson Willis, Appellant Pro Se. Charles Christopher Henderson, Trenton, North Carolina; Daniel Calvin Oakley, Assistant Attorney General, Michael F. Easley, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina; Charles Edwin Hamilton, III, Anne Margaret Hayes, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Johnson Willis appeals the district court's order dismissing the federal and state Defendants, denying the local government Defendants' motion to dismiss some claims, and dismissing the remaining claims. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the order is 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 order here appealed is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order.

We grant the Appellees' motion to dismiss the appeal. 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