

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-1415

TIGRESS SYDNEY ACUTE MCDANIEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HUNTER WARFIELD, INC.; EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES, LLC;
EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INCORPORATED; EXPERIAN
DATA CORPORATION; EXPERIAN SERVICES CORP.; TRANSUNION DATA
SOLUTIONS LLC; TRANSUNION, LLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (5:23-cv-00732-D-BM)

Submitted: September 12, 2024

Decided: September 16, 2024

Before THACKER and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tigress Sydney Acute McDaniel, Appellant Pro Se. Eric Fristedt Barton, SEYFARTH
SHAW, LLP, Atlanta, Georgia; Caren D. Enloe, SMITH DEBNAM NARRON DRAKE
SAINTSING & MYERS, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Christy Cochran Dunn, Robert
Cowan deRosset, IV, YOUNG MOORE & HENDERSON, PA, Raleigh, North Carolina;
Camille R. Nicodemus, QUILLING SELANDER LOWNDS WINSLETT MOSER,

Indianapolis, Indiana, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tigress Sydney Acute McDaniel seeks to appeal the district court's order (a) dismissing McDaniel's claims against the named credit reporting agencies; and (b) denying McDaniel's motion for Judge Dever's recusal. 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 appealed-from order is not a final order given that litigation on McDaniel's claims remains ongoing against Defendant Hunter Warfield, Inc. And while McDaniel's informal brief restates her allegations of judicial bias, that portion of the appealed-from order—specifically, Judge Dever's denial of McDaniel's recusal motion—is not an immediately appealable interlocutory or collateral ruling. *See In re Va. Elec. & Power Co.*, 539 F.2d 357, 363-64 (4th Cir. 1976); *accord Mischler v. Bevin*, 887 F.3d 271, 271 (6th Cir. 2018) (per curiam) (“[A]n order denying recusal is not immediately appealable under the collateral order doctrine.”). Accordingly, we dismiss this 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