

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6716

MAURICE DUNBAR ,

Plaintiff - Appellant ,

and

REGINALD C. MACK; LLOYD BENNETT; TERENCE HAYES; JEREMIAH BARTLEY; RAYMOND FLORES; JOHNNY BURCH; SHERMAN A. DAVIS; DAVID LEE CRADLE, JR.; ISAAC NELSON; JORGE MUNGUIA; JIMMIE JACKSON, JR.; MIAMI SIMPSON; CHARLES PRYOR; JUSTIN L. JONES; MICHAEL MCCOY; DAVID JOHNSON; ANTHONY RILEY; QUINCY HOLLEY; MARLON CURRY; ADRIAN CORNELIUS; JAMES JOHNSON; ARMANDO GOMEZ-JAIMEZ; MARLOS STEVENSON; VINCENT L. PINKARD; MARCELO ARANDA RANGEL; FRANKLIN J. DOUGLAS; HENRY WISE; JOSE JAIRO LOPEZ; KEITH BRANNON; JAMAL JOHNSON; JEFFERY L. JONES; WESLEY CHANDLER; ANTOINE C. BAKER; WILLIAM L. NEWTON; ANTONIO HARMON; TOBY HAMM; JAMES BROOKS; EDWIN TODD SANDERS; MICHAEL TILLMAN; CURTIS JACKSON; JEROME CROSSLAND; VAUGHNTA JONES; TAYON YOUNG; CLARENCE PADGETT; JOHNNY DICKERSON; BRIAN WILLIAMSON; LUCIO CAVANYA MENDEZ; FELIPE DEJESUS ALVARADO BALDERAS; RIAN LOPEZ; WILLIAM ERNEST BETHEL ,

Plaintiffs ,

versus

JAMES METTS, in charge of Lexington County Detention Center; CITY COUNCIL, or Person Oursee of the Courts ,

Defendants - Appellees .

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (2:10-cv-01775-HMH)

Submitted: October 18, 2011

Decided: October 21, 2011

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Maurice Dunbar, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Maurice Dunbar appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing his complaint without prejudice. Because Dunbar may amend his complaint to cure the defects identified by the district court, the dismissal order is interlocutory and not appealable. See Chao v. Rivendell Woods, Inc., 415 F.3d 342, 345 (4th Cir. 2005); 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 dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED