George Yarid v. Layton Harman Appeal: 13-1048 Doc: 10 Filed: 04/29/2013 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1048

GEORGE ALEXANDER YARID,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LAYTON HARMAN; ROBERT ROONEY; JOHN LUCAS; AL HORFORD; ED DAVIS; BRODIE BRUCE; SCOTT HATRNELL; KURT DONALDSON; PAUL WRIGHT; GORDAN FREEMAN; MIKE DANNER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr., District Judge. (3:12-cv-00237-JRS)

Submitted: April 25, 2013 Decided: April 29, 2013

Before AGEE and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

George Alexander Yarid, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404420075

PER CURIAM:

George Alexander Yarid appeals the district court's order dismissing his complaint without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2006). This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-47 (1949). Because the district court found Yarid's particularized complaint too vague and conclusory to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, but allowed him to amplify the factual and legal bases on which his claims rest and refile his complaint, we conclude that the district court's order is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED