

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2054

WILLIAM EL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GREENSBORO POLICE DEPARTMENT, A Corporation; WAYNE SCOTT, Chief of Police; STEVEN KORY FLOWERS, In His Individual and Official Capacity; NANCY B. VAUGHN, Mayor of Greensboro, In Her Official Capacity; GUILFORD COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, A Corporation; MICHELLE MACADLO, In Her Individual and Official Capacity; HEATHER SKEENS, In Her Individual and Official Capacity; RON ORGIAS, In His Individual and Official Capacity; BILL BENCINI, Mayor of High Point, In His Official Capacity; HIGH POINT POLICE DEPARTMENT, A Corporation; MARTY SUMNER, Chief of Police, In His Own Capacity,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

STEPHANIE REESE, In Her Individual and Official Capacity; C. E. JENKINS, In Official and Individual Capacity,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, District Judge. (1:16-cv-00014-TDS-JEP)

Submitted: March 27, 2017

Decided: April 28, 2017

Before MOTZ, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William El, Appellant Pro Se. James Anthony Clark, Associate General Counsel, Polly D. Sizemore, CITY OF GREENSBORO LEGAL DEPARTMENT, Greensboro, North Carolina; Matthew Livingston Mason, GUILFORD COUNTY SHERIFF'S ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William El seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his complaint without prejudice as to seven defendants and ordering a show of good cause for failure to properly effect service on the other four defendants. 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. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order El seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. 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