

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-2219**

---

GRAHAM SCHIFF,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ANTHONY BROWN, Maryland Attorney General; JOHN MCCARTHY,  
Montgomery County State's Attorney; NICHOLAS PICERNO, Captain for  
Montgomery County Police; MARCUS JONES, Chief of Montgomery County  
Police; MONTGOMERY COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.  
Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:23-cv-00338-DKC)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2024

Decided: February 5, 2024

---

Before KING, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Graham Harry Schiff, Appellant Pro Se. Wendy Lozinsky Shiff, OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Donna McBride,  
MILLER, MILLER & CANBY, Rockville, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Graham Schiff seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motions for a preliminary injunction, for a temporary restraining order, to disqualify counsel, and for summary judgment, granting in part and denying in part two motions to dismiss, and dismissing certain claims. 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). The denial of a preliminary injunction is immediately appealable. After reviewing the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion for a preliminary injunction because Schiff has not demonstrated his claims are likely to succeed on the merits. We therefore deny in part Defendants' motion to dismiss and affirm this portion of the district court's order. However, the remaining portion of the order is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we grant in part Defendants' motion to dismiss and dismiss this portion of the appeal 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*