

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6727

STEVEN M. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WEXFORD HEALTH SERVICES; DR. AVA JOUBERT, Medical Director for WCI; DAVIS, Physician Aide; N.P. JANETTE CLARK; DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (DPSCS); DAYENA CORCORAN, Commissioner of Corrections; SHARON BAUCOM, DPSCS Medical Director,

Defendants – Appellees,

and

WARDEN R. GRAHAM, JR.,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Paula Xinis, District Judge. (8:18-cv-01096-PX)

Submitted: January 8, 2019

Decided: January 18, 2019

Before DUNCAN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Steven M. Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. Douglas Conrad Meister, Gina Marie Smith, MEYERS, RODBELL & ROSENBAUM, PA, Riverdale Park, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Steven M. Johnson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motions to appoint counsel, to remand and join, to remand, for request of witness, for appointment of Masters, and for sanctions. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order that Johnson seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order.* 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

* To the extent the district court's denial of Johnson's motion for sanctions may be immediately appealable under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1) (2012), we conclude that Johnson has not sought review of that denial on appeal. See 4th Cir. 34(b) (limiting our review to issues raised in informal brief); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014).