

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1499

RYAN MCFADYEN; MATTHEW WILSON; BRECK ARCHER,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

LINWOOD E. WILSON,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

DUKE UNIVERSITY; DUKE UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPT.; AARON GRAVES; ROBERT DEAN; LEILA HUMPHRIES; PHYLLIS COOPER; WILLIAM F. GARBER, III; JAMES SCHWAB; JOSEPH FLEMING; JEFFREY O. BEST; GARY N. SMITH; GREG STOTSENBERG; ROBERT K. STEEL; RICHARD H. BRODHEAD, PHD; PETER LANGE, PHD; TALLMAN TRASK, III, PHD; JOHN BURNES; LARRY MONETA, ED.D.; DUKE UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEMS; PRIVATE DIAGNOSTIC CLINIC, P.L.L.C.; JULIE MANLY, M.D.; THERESA ARICO, R.N.; TARA LEVICY, R.N.; CITY OF DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA; MICHAEL B. NIFONG; PATRICK BAKER; STEVEN CHALMERS; RONALD HODGE; LEE RUSS; STEPHEN MIHAICH; BEVERLY COUNCIL; EDWARD SARVIS; JEFF LAMB; MICHAEL RIPBERGER; LAIRD EVANS; JAMES T. SOUKUP; KAMMIE MICHAEL; DAVID W. ADDISON; MARK D. GOTTLIEB; BENJAMIN W. HIMAN; RICHARD D. CLAYTON; DNA SECURITY, INC.; RICHARD CLARK; BRIAN MEEHAN, PHD; VICTOR J. DZAU, M.D.; ALLISON HALTON; KEMEL DAWKINS; SUZANNE WASIOLEK; STEPHEN BRYAN; MATTHEW DRUMMOND; DUKE POLICE DEFENDANTS,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. James A. Beaty, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:07-cv-00953-JAB-JEP)

Submitted: October 30, 2014

Decided: November 4, 2014

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Linwood Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Christopher Ekstrand, Stefanie Anne Smith, EKSTRAND & EKSTRAND, LLP, Durham, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Linwood Wilson seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing two claims against him and denying his motion for sanctions. 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 the order did not dispose of all claims against all parties, it is not a final order. See Robinson v. Parke-Davis & Co., 685 F.2d 912, 913 (4th Cir. 1982) (per curiam). Nor is it an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis and 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