

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-2214**

---

LOUSHONDA MYERS; CM, a minor child; AM, a minor child; MM;  
TYRE MYERS; DAMEON MYERS; MARVIN MYERS, JR.; CHARLENA  
FRANKLIN; ERNEST MATTISON; SANDRA MATTISON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

AT&T CORPORATION; UNKNOWN AGENTS OF AT&T CORPORATION; US  
MARSHALS SERVICE; UNKNOWN AGENTS OF US MARSHAL SERVICE;  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION; UNKNOWN AGENTS OF FEDERAL  
BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION; PAUL GARDNER; JEFFREY M. LONG;  
PATRICK J. MALEY; ROBERT WAIZENHOFFER; JEFFREY J. BRUNING;  
WILLIE HINDS; GEORGETOWN CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT; UNKNOWN  
OFFICERS, AGENTS OF GEORGETOWN CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT; 15TH  
CIRCUIT DRUG ENFORCEMENT UNIT, formerly Georgetown County  
Organized Crime Bureau; GREG HEMBREE; SCOTT HIXON; STEPHEN  
BROWN; MAGDELINE SALMENO; SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT  
DIVISION, SLED; UNKNOWN LAW ENFORCEMENT SOURCES IN SOUTH  
CAROLINA; KERI POPE; KEENAN KEITH; RANDY GAMBLE; JIMMY  
CAGLE; JODY WARD; MICAH LEDDY; GEORGETOWN COUNTY SHERIFF'S  
DEPARTMENT; UNKNOWN OFFICERS, AGENTS OF GEORGETOWN COUNTY  
SHERIFF'S OFFICE; BRYAN KONIG; JACK SCOVILLE; 15TH CIRCUIT  
SOLICITOR'S OFFICE, Georgetown and Horry Counties; DAN FURR;  
KELVIN WAITES; SCOTT SCOGGIN; LANE CRIBB; UNKNOWN INFORMANTS  
AND-OR WITNESSES OF THE GCPD; NELSON BROWN; GLEN KUFEN;  
JERMAINE ARMSTRONG; STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; JOHN HILLIARD,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District  
Judge. (2:13-cv-01432-RMG)

---

Submitted: March 7, 2014

Decided: April 1, 2014

---

Before KING and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Loushonda Myers; CM; AM; MM; Tyre Myers; Dameon Myers; Marvin Myers, Jr.; Charlena Franklin; Ernest Mattison; Sandra Mattison, Appellants Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

The Appellants seek to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing their civil complaint without prejudice and without service of process. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 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). The order Appellants seek to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See Penn-America Ins. Co. v. Mapp, 521 F.3d 290, 294-96 (4th Cir. 2008); Go Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 508 F.3d 170, 176 (4th Cir. 2007); 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