

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-6791

ROBERT LOUIS GARRETT, JR., a/k/a Chubby, a/k/a Chubb, a/k/a Tru, a/k/a Kweli, a/k/a Justice,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHAD BINKLEY; UNKNOWN OFFICERS, From 9 May 2015 Attack,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 19-6834

ROBERT LOUIS GARRETT, JR., a/k/a Chubby, a/k/a Chubb, a/k/a Tru, a/k/a Kweli, a/k/a Justice,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHAD BINKLEY; UNKNOWN OFFICERS, From 9 May 2015 Attack,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge; Paige Jones Gossett, Magistrate Judge. (0:18-cv-01416-CMC-PJG)

Submitted: September 24, 2019

Decided: September 27, 2019

Before WYNN and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert Louis Garrett, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Louis Garrett, Jr., appeals the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying his motions for a preliminary injunction and a hearing on the preliminary injunction and denying his motion to alter or amend, a subsequent order allowing Garrett to amend or supplement his complaint but denying appointment of counsel, and the magistrate judge's orders denying his motions to compel and for appointment of counsel in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action. 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 denial of Garrett's motion for a preliminary injunction is an appealable interlocutory order. 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the denial of the preliminary injunction or motion to reconsider. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Garrett v. Binkley*, No. 0:18-cv-01416-CMC-PJG (D.S.C. Apr. 12, 2019; May 30, 2019). The orders allowing Garrett to amend or supplement his complaint and denying his motions to compel and for counsel are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of the appeals for lack of jurisdiction.

*AFFIRMED IN PART,
DISMISSED IN PART*