UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 20-2057	
CARLA T. LEWIS,		
Plaintiff - App	pellant,	
V.		
J. T. FANNING, Divisional Mana	ger, M.D.; WELLS F	ARGO N. A.,
Defendants -	Appellees.	
Appeal from the United States I Richmond. David J. Novak, Distr		
Submitted: May 20, 2021		Decided: May 24, 2021
Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYE	R, and MOTZ, Circui	t Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
Carla T. Lewis, Appellant Pro HAMILTON SANDERS, LLP, Vi		•
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Carla T. Lewis seeks to appeal the district court's order finding that Lewis' complaint did not satisfy Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) and ordering her to file a particularized amended complaint. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). "[D]ismissals without prejudice generally are not appealable 'unless the grounds for dismissal clearly indicate that no amendment in the complaint could cure the defects in the plaintiff's case." *Bing v. Brivo Sys., LLC*, 959 F.3d 605, 610 (4th Cir. 2020) (quoting *Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Loc. Union 392*, 10 F.3d 1064, 1067 (4th Cir. 1993)), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 1376 (2021). Because the district court permitted Lewis to amend her complaint, and Lewis has done so, we conclude that the court's order is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order.

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny Lewis' "motion to stable probate." 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