

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2431

RONALD I. PAUL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; PAUL D. DE HOLCZER, individually and as a partner of the law firm of Moses, Koon & Brackett, PC; G. L. BUCKLES, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Keith J. Buckles and G. L. Buckles individually personal representative Keith J. Buckles; MICHAEL H. QUINN, Individually and as senior lawyer of Quinn Law Firm, LLC; J. CHARLES ORMOND, JR., individually and as partner of the Law Firm of Holler, Dennis, Corbett, Ormond, Plante & Garner; OSCAR K. RUCKER, in his individual capacity as Director, Rights of Way South Carolina Department of Transportation; MACIE M. GRESHAM, in her individual capacity as Eastern Region Right of Way Program Manager South Carolina Department of Transportation; NATALIE J. MOORE, in her individual capacity as Assistant Chief Counsel, South Carolina Department of Transportation,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:13-cv-01852-CMC)

Submitted: April 30, 2014

Decided: May 14, 2014

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald I. Paul, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald I. Paul seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint without prejudice and the order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. 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). Because Paul may proceed with this action in the district court by amending his complaint to provide specific facts showing his entitlement to the relief he seeks, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), the orders he seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. See 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 grant Paul's motions to file supplemental briefs and deny his motion for summary reversal, as amended. We also 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