

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 26-12564  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

ANDREW P. MOORE, II,

*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

*versus*

COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,  
Official Capacity,  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE SOCIAL  
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF THE  
TREASURY,

SECRETARY OF TREASURY OF USA,  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR DEPARTMENT OF  
THE TREASURY,  
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, et al.,

*Defendants-Appellees.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Florida  
D.C. Docket No. 6:25-cv-02002-CEM-NWH

---

Before BRANCH, ABUDU, and KIDD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Andrew Peal Moore, II, proceeding pro se, appeals from the magistrate judge's orders granting the defendants' motion to set aside the clerk's entries of default and denying his motion for the clerk's entry of default and default judgment.

The appealed orders are not final because neither order ended the litigation on the merits nor resolved any of Moore's claims. 28 U.S.C. § 1291; *see CSX Transp., Inc. v. City of Garden City*, 235 F.3d 1325, 1327 (11th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a final decision ends the litigation on the merits and leaves nothing for the district court to do but execute its judgment); *Mass. Cas. Ins. Co. v. Forman*, 469 F.2d 259, 260 n.1 (5th Cir. 1972) (explaining that the denial of a motion for default judgment is not a final, appealable order).

Further, the orders are not appealable interlocutory orders because nothing suggests that they would be effectively unreviewable on appeal from a final judgment or that delaying review would imperil a substantial public interest. *See Acheron Cap., Ltd. v. Mukamal*, 22 F.4th 979, 989 (11th Cir. 2022) (explaining that, among other requirements, an order must be effectively unreviewable on appeal from a final judgment to be appealable under the collateral

26-12564

Opinion of the Court

3

order doctrine); *Mohawk Indus., Inc. v. Carpenter*, 558 U.S. 100, 107 (2009).

Accordingly, this appeal is DISMISSED, sua sponte, for lack of jurisdiction.