UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-1351

CHARITY MAINVILLE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

EUGENE H. SOAR, Clerk of the North Carolina Court of Appeals; DAVID M. YOPP, Attorney at Hatch, Little & Bunn, LLP; MARGARET P. EAGLES, Chief District Court Judge, Wake County; CHRISTINE M. WALCZYK, Lead Civil Court Judge, Wake County District Court; VARTAN A. DAVIDIAN, III, District Court Judge, Wake County; JOHN DOES 1-3, Unknown appellate judges of the North Carolina Cout of Appeals; ANNA C. DE SANTIS; KARLENE SCOTT TURRENTINE, Administrative Law Judge,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (1:25-cv-00417-WO-LPA)

Submitted: August 27, 2026 Decided: August 31, 2026

Before KING, HEYTENS, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charity Mainville, Appellant Pro Se. Sean G. Delaney, HATCH, LITTLE & BUNN, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee David M. Yopp. Natalia K. Isenberg, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee

Karlene Scott Turrentine.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charity Mainville seeks to appeal the district court's order denying several motions in her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, all of which essentially asked the court to reconsider its previous denial of her motion for an emergency temporary restraining order (TRO) and to issue a TRO. The court's order also overruled Mainville's objections to the magistrate judge's order denying her authorization to file electronically. On appeal, Mainville has filed a motion to recuse two judges of this court and a motion for injunctive relief pending appeal.

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 order Mainville seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order.[*] Accordingly, we deny Mainville's pending motions and 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

[*] An order denying a preliminary injunction is an immediately appealable interlocutory order. 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). However, we lack jurisdiction to review the denial of a temporary restraining order. *Off. of Pers. Mgmt. v. Am. Fed'n of Gov't Emps.*, 473 U.S. 1301, 1303-05 (1985); *Drudge v. McKernon*, 482 F.2d 1375, 1376 (4th Cir. 1973).