


Dear Supreme Court of the United States.
I am asking for more time and a new motion for leave
to proceed in forma pauperis. Application was destroyed
by water. I had my application my cell floor flooded
they cells and water came in ~~in~~ under my door
destroyed the pauper's application. I am motioning
for an extension of time. due to my application getting
destroyed. Thank you all for your all time and help
about this matter.
Sgn. Marshall Leon Watkins. This is my sound letter



UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 18-7486

MARSHALL LEON WATKINS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NURSE JONES; LIEUTENANT SMITH; LIEUTENANT SURRETT; SGT. LAWLESS; LIEUTENANT BLACKWELL; LT. TAYLOR; MS. PHYALL; JAMES SIMMONS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

KEVIN CROSS,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (0:17-cv-00135-MGL-PJG)

Submitted: April 4, 2019

Decided: April 10, 2019

Before NIEMEYER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marshall Leon Watkins, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Raymond Kropski, EARHART OVERSTREET LLC, Charleston, South Carolina; Steven Michael Pruitt, MCDONALD,

PATRICK, POSTON, HEMPHILL & ROPER, LLC, Greenwood, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marshall Leon Watkins seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and ruling on his claims against Appellees. 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. § 1291 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). After reviewing the record, we conclude that the district court did not rule on Watkins' claims against Kevin Cross. Thus, the district court's order is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. *Porter v. Zook*, 803 F.3d 694, 696-97 (4th Cir. 2015). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and remand the case to the district court so that the court can consider Watkins' claims against Cross. We also deny Watkins' motions to investigate, to review argument, and to contact the district court about video tape evidence.

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 AND REMANDED