

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1840

YAHDNA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, a/k/a Phyllis Yahdina Overstreet-U-Deen,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL; STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; S.C.D.C. GENERAL COUNSEL, With all of its members; BRYAN STIRLING, S.C.D.C. Director; S.C.D.C. DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL; WARDEN JAMES; A.W. SMITH; A.W. MCDUFFY; MAJOR MEEKS; SGT. CROWLEY; NURSE MILLER; WARDEN STONEBREAKER; UNITED STATES CONGRESS, And all members contained therein; CATHOLIC ARCH DIOCESE AND POPE; MR. LAWRENZ, Director of the Well Path Center; WELL PATH CENTER; 194 MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS; COUNTY OF RICHLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA; COUNTY OF KERSHAW; COUNTY OF HORRY; ADAIR FORD BOROUGHS, Federal Attorney for the State of South Carolina, U.S. Attorney; UNITED STATES SENATE, And all members contained therein,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.
Bruce H. Hendricks, District Judge. (9:25-cv-01527-BHH-MHC)

Submitted: May 28, 2026

Decided: June 1, 2026

Before WYNN, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yahdina Overstreet-U-Deen, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yahdina Overstreet-U-Deen seeks to appeal the district court's orders (1) separating her complaint from three co-plaintiffs and (2) denying her motions for appointment of counsel, recusal of the district court judge, recusal of the magistrate judge, appointment of a new magistrate judge, an extension of time, permission to intervene, consolidation of cases, complex case designation, and various other forms of relief.* This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292, Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The orders Overstreet-U-Deen seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

* Overstreet-U-Deen has also filed motions in this court to remand; to consolidate this appeal with docket numbers 25-6598, 25-6599, 25-6602; to vacate; for acceptance; for judicial notice; for a preliminary injunction; for a temporary restraining order; for sanctions; for a declaratory judgment; to submit additional evidence; and to supplement her motions. We grant Overstreet-U-Deen's motion to accept her corrected, signed notice of appeal and deny all remaining motions.