

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-2424**

---

CHARLENE RAIFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY, through the BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA; RAYMOND C. PIERCE, In his individual capacity; LAUREN COLLINS, In her individual capacity; NICHELLE PERRY, In her individual capacity,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

GEORGE MELVILLE JOHNSON,

Party-in-Interest.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:12-cv-00548-CCE-JEP)

---

Submitted: March 20, 2017

Decided: March 28, 2017

---

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charlene Raiford, Appellant Pro Se. Kimberly D. Potter,  
Assistant Attorney General, Joseph A. Newsome, NORTH CAROLINA  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Vicente O. De La  
Cruz, MELVILLE JOHNSON, P.C., Atlanta, Georgia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charlene Raiford appeals the district court's orders denying Defendants' summary judgment motion in part, entering judgment in favor of Defendants after a jury trial, and denying her postverdict motion for judgment as a matter of law. We affirm in part and dismiss in part.

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 summary judgment order Raiford seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Ortiz v. Jordan, 562 U.S. 180, 184 (2011) (holding that "a party . . . [may not] appeal an order denying summary judgment after a full trial on the merits" because that "order retains its interlocutory character as simply a step along the route to final judgment"). Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Turning to Raiford's appeal of the jury verdict in Defendants' favor and the denial of her postverdict motion, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. There was no abuse of discretion in the district court's handling of the video deposition, the challenged jury instructions accurately conveyed relevant contextual information to the jury,

and the evidence supported the jury's verdict. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment. Raiford v. N.C. Cent. Univ., No. 1:12-cv-00548-CCE-JEP (M.D.N.C. Oct. 15, 2015). 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART;  
DISMISSED IN PART