

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1278

DEREK JARVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENTERPRISE FLEET SERVICES AND LEASING COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1675

DEREK JARVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENTERPRISE FLEET SERVICES AND LEASING COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1681

DEREK JARVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENTERPRISE FLEET SERVICES AND LEASING COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1718

DEREK JARVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ENTERPRISE FLEET SERVICES AND LEASING COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge; Charles B. Day, Magistrate Judge. (8:07-cv-03385-DKC)

Submitted: July 30, 2009

Decided: August 4, 2009

Before MOTZ, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Derek Jarvis, Appellant Pro Se. Edward Lee Isler, ISLER, DARE, RAY, RADCLIFFE & CONNOLLY, PC, Vienna, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Derek Jarvis seeks to appeal various orders in civil action: the denial of his motion to compel discovery, the denial of his motion for stay, the denial of his motion to recuse the district judge, and the order granting Defendant's motion to compel discovery. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The orders Jarvis seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we grant Appellee's motion to dismiss the appeal as this Court lacks jurisdiction. We also deny Jarvis' motion for default judgment and for stay pending appeal and Appellee's motion for sanctions and motion for an extension of time to respond to Jarvis' motion for default judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED