

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7725

SUNDARI K. PRASAD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MONICA K. VICK, Drug Addict; HAMILTON L. HENDRIX; GLORIA DALE LEWIS-SORRELL; SHARON LEWIS-PAULS, Retired; JONATHAN D. HEADLEE, HRRJ; DAVID CARPENTER; OCEAN CLARK; CHOCOLATE FACTORY; OMID AMIRI; JANE MASSEY; CAROLYN D. NELSON; GAIL NELSON; POUNCEE NELSON, and the Nelson Family; JIM SORRELL; PAULEY PAULS, The Estate of June Lewis; VIVIENNE B. CHEEK; ASHTON HENDRIX; TRACY BOSLEY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, District Judge. (3:16-cv-00040-MHL-RCY)

Submitted: April 20, 2017

Decided: April 24, 2017

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sundari K. Prasad, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sundari K. Prasad seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action for failure to adequately comply with the magistrate judge's order to further particularize Prasad's complaint. 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 the filing of an amended complaint, we conclude that the order Prasad seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. *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 the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.* We deny Prasad's motion to seal confidential documents, as no such documents have been filed in this court. 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 this matter to the district court, though, because the court previously afforded Prasad the chance to amend her complaint. *Cf. Goode*, 807 F.3d at 629-30.