[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the

United States Court of Appeals

For the Fleventh Circuit

No. 25-11045

Non-Argument Calendar

JOHN T. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR ASSET FORFEITURE,
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (FBI), et al.,

Opinion of the Court

25-11045

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia D.C. Docket No. 1:25-cv-01320-MHC

Before JORDAN, BRANCH, and LAGOA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

This appeal is DISMISSED, *sua sponte*, for lack of jurisdiction. John Williams, proceedings *pro se*, appeals from the magistrate judge's March 17, 2025, order, which granted Williams leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and recommended that his complaint be dismissed as frivolous and that the filing injunction against him be expanded.

A magistrate judge's recommendation on a dispositive matter that has not been adopted or otherwise rendered final by the district court at the time the notice of appeal is filed is not final and appealable. See Perez-Priego v. Alachua Cnty. Clerk of Ct., 148 F.3d 1272, 1273 (11th Cir. 1998); 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1), 1291. The district court's subsequent adoption of the recommendation did not cure Williams's premature notice of appeal. See Perez-Priego, 148 F.3d at 1273. Additionally, Williams lacks standing to challenge the magistrate judge's grant of his application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis because that ruling did not injure him in any way. See Wolff v. Cash 4 Titles, 351 F.3d 1348, 1353-54 (11th Cir. 2003); Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. v. Barrow, 29 F.4th 1299, 1301 (11th Cir. 2022).

2

25-11045 Opinion of the Court

No petition for rehearing may be filed unless it complies with the timing and other requirements of 11th Cir. R. 40-3 and all other applicable rules.

3