

FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

January 12, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

ROBERT N HOUSTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS; NAPHCARE
WYOMING LLC; ISABELLE FARMER;
KUNTAL PANDIT; RN GONZALEZ;
VANESSA HEUSMAN; TODD
MARTIN; JENNIFER BOHN; LSW
PROVIANCE MENTAL HEALTH;
AUDRA DUDZINSKI; TAKESHA
BANKS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-8077
(D.C. No. 2:25-CV-00167-KHR)
(D. Wyo.)

ORDER

Before **HARTZ**, **EID**, and **CARSON**, Circuit Judges.

This matter is before us on Appellant Robert Houston’s response to the court’s order to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of appellate jurisdiction.

This court’s appellate jurisdiction is generally limited to review of final decisions of the district courts. 28 U.S.C. § 1291. A final decision is “one that terminates all matters as to all parties and causes of action.” *Utah v. Norton*, 396 F.3d 1281, 1286 (10th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks omitted). Here, the district court case remains

pending. Mr. Houston seeks to appeal the district court's interlocutory order denying his motion for appointment of counsel.

There is a narrow exception to the final judgment rule for orders that satisfy the collateral order doctrine of *Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corporation*, 337 U.S. 541 (1949). But an order denying a motion for appointment of counsel in a civil case is not an immediately appealable collateral order. *See Cotner v. Mason*, 657 F.2d 1390, 1392 (10th Cir. 1981) (holding that orders denying appointment of counsel in civil cases do not satisfy the collateral order doctrine). Such an order can be reviewed on appeal after final judgment, and the circumstances of this case do not warrant departure from the strong policy against piecemeal appellate review. *See id.*

Because we lack jurisdiction to consider this appeal, the appeal is dismissed.

Entered for the Court

Per Curiam