

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-6793**

---

SCOTT ELLIOTT TURNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY DETENTION CENTER; DR. RIVERA, Corizon  
Health,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  
George L. Russell, III, District Judge. (1:17-cv-01286-GLR)

---

Submitted: October 17, 2017

Decided: October 20, 2017

---

Before FLOYD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed in part, dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Scott Elliott Turner, Appellant Pro Se. Philip E. Culpepper, ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY  
OFFICE OF LAW, Annapolis, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Scott Elliott Turner seeks to appeal the district court's order denying preliminary injunctive relief in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action, dismissing one defendant, and ordering the remaining defendant to respond to Turner's complaint. To the extent that Turner challenges the denial of a preliminary injunction, we have jurisdiction to consider this portion of the order, 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1) (2012), and conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by denying the injunction, *United States v. South Carolina*, 720 F.3d 518, 524 (4th Cir. 2013) (stating standard of review); *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008) (listing elements needed to obtain preliminary injunction). Accordingly, we affirm the denial of a preliminary injunction.

To the extent Turner seeks to appeal other portions of the district court's order, we lack jurisdiction to consider these challenges because the remainder of the order is neither a final order, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order, 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). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal in part 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.

*AFFIRMED IN PART, DISMISSED IN PART*