UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 14-1233

———————

PETER S. VINAL,

                Plaintiff - Appellant,

      v.

SUNTRUST MORTGAGE INCORPORATED,

                Defendant - Appellee,

      and

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION; JOSEPH C. IRVING;
KATHY B. BAGBY; SAFEGUARD PROPERTIES LLC; JOHN DOES, to be
named later,

                Defendants.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. James C. Dever, III,
Chief District Judge. (7:13-cv-00159-D)

———————

Submitted: September 25, 2014   Decided: September 29, 2014

———————

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

———————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

James W. Lea, III, THE LEA/SCHULTZ LAW FIRM, P.C., Wilmington,
North Carolina, for Appellant. Camden R. Webb, Elizabeth C.

Stone, WILLIAMS MULLEN, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Peter S. Vinal seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendant SunTrust Mortgage Inc.'s motion to dismiss Vinal's complaint for failure to state a claim under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), and dismissing SunTrust as a defendant. 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 Vinal seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order, as the claims against Defendant Safeguard Properties, LLC, remain pending in the district court. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal as interlocutory. See Dickens v. Aetna Life Ins. Co., 677 F.3d 228, 229–30 (4th Cir. 2012) (holding that this court is required to inquire into its jurisdiction sua sponte).

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

3