

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-1904

KEVIN DONNELL MURPHY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MARY A. JACKSON, U.S. Naval Research Laboratory,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 24-1905

KEVIN DONNELL MURPHY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RUTH SHUMAN, Program Director; NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1906

KEVIN DONNELL MURPHY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF DELAWARE FAMILY COURT; DIVISION OF CHILD
SUPPORT SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1907

KEVIN DONNELL MURPHY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AMY ANTHONY, Director of Motor Vehicle Administration in the State of
Delaware; ALL THE WORKERS THAT WERE INVOLVED IN THE
VIOLATING MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUSPENSION OF MY
LICENSE, Motor Vehicles administrative State of Delaware workers,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1908

KEVIN DONNELL MURPHY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF DELAWARE FAMILY COURT; ANDREZA PETICACIS, Mediator
at Delaware Family Court; MICHELLE HOFFMAN, Delaware Family Court
Administrator, Director of Case Flow Management; THEODORE MERMIGOS,
Division Director, Child Support Services, State of Delaware; DEBORAH
GERMAINE GUERIN; GLADYS SEWELL; JULIE SHAHAN;
RICHARDSON-GRABLE; KATHY JENNINGS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Stephanie A. Gallagher, District Judge. (1:24-cv-00323-SAG; 1:24-cv-01586-SAG; 1:24-cv-01587-SAG; 1:24-cv-01702-SAG); Julie R. Rubin, District Judge. (1:24-cv-01588-JRR)

Submitted: January 23, 2025

Decided: January 27, 2025

Before WILKINSON, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin Donnell Murphy, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Donnell Murphy seeks to appeal the district court's orders in his five civil actions. In No. 24-1904, Murphy seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendant's motion for an extension of time to file a response to Murphy's complaint. Similarly, No. 24-1905, Murphy seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendants' motion for an extension of time to file a response to Murphy's amended complaint in that action. In No. 24-1906, Murphy seeks to appeal the district court's marginal order denying Murphy's motion to reconsider the court's prior order transferring the case based on improper venue. In No. 24-1907, Murphy seeks to appeal the district's order transferring his claim against officers of the Delaware Department of Motor Vehicles to the district court in Delaware. Finally, No. 24-1908, Murphy seeks to appeal the district court's order transferring his claims against the Delaware Family Court system and Delaware Department of Child Support Services to the district court in Delaware.

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 orders Murphy seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders.*

* We also lack jurisdiction over three of Murphy's appeals (No. 24-1906, No. 24-1907, and No. 24-1908) for a separate reason: his notices of appeal were untimely. *See Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007) (“[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement.”); Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A) (“In a civil case, [with exceptions not relevant to those three appeals], the notice of appeal required by Rule 3 must be filed with the district clerk within 30 days after entry of the judgment or order appealed from.”).

See, e.g., In re Carefirst of Md., Inc., 305 F.3d 253, 262 (4th Cir. 2002) (holding that orders transferring actions to another district court are not final or immediately appealable collateral orders). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeals in all of the cases for lack of jurisdiction. In light of that decision, we also deny Murphy's pending motions in No. 24-1907 as moot. 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