

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-7350**

---

SUNDARI K. PRASAD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SHAKITA MASSEY-TAYLOR; DEBORAH S. ROE; ELIZABETH WICKLINE;  
JUDGE NOLAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 17-7483**

---

SUNDARI K. PRASAD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HAMILTON L. HENDRIX; GLORIA D. LEWIS-SORRELL; JAMES SORRELL;  
SHARON LEWIS-PAULS; PAULEY O. PAULS; MONICA K. VICK; S. JONES,  
Vick's Mother; ASHTON HENDRIX; T. BOSLEY; DANIELS, TUCK &  
RITTER, T. Williams; PETER DECKER; JUDSON COLLIER; NED MIKLUA;  
ROBERT SAUNDERS; LINDA LAMBERT; VA STATE BAR, Jane Fletcher; A.  
MICHELE CAVANAUGH; THOMAS A. BURCHER; ROBERT DAWSON;  
STEPHEN BLOOMQUEST; W. WARNER; DAVID LEE; GAIL NELSON-  
WALKER; TARA A. MCGEE; RICHARD LOCKE; RICK FRIEDMAN; EMILY  
MUNN; ERICKA M. BATTLE; WARE & MORRISON, c/o Nancy Morrison,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, District Judge. (3:17-cv-00066-MHL-RCY; 3:17-cv-00040-MHL-RCY)

---

Submitted: February 22, 2018

Decided: February 27, 2018

---

Before TRAXLER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sundari K. Prasad, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Sundari K. Prasad seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing without prejudice two of Prasad's pending 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) actions for failure to adequately comply with the magistrate judge's orders to submit second particularized complaints. 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, 545-47 (1949). Because the deficiencies identified by the district court may be remedied by supplementing the complaints as directed, we conclude that the orders Prasad seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. *Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc.*, 807 F.3d 619, 623-24 (4th Cir. 2015); *Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union* 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we dismiss these appeals 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*

---

\* We do not remand either of these matters to the district court, though, because the court previously and repeatedly afforded Prasad the chance to further particularize and amend her complaints, and she failed to do so. *Cf. Goode*, 807 F.3d at 629-30.