

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1916**

---

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE; STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; WAKE COUNTY  
NORTH CAROLINA MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT; TOWN OF CARY NORTH  
CAROLINA; SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 14-1999**

---

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, II,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

BABY J.F.D., c/o William S. Davis, II; ESTATE OF WILLIAM  
SCOTT DAVIS, SR., Deceased,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALBERT J. SINGER; DANIELLE DOYLE; SYDNEY J. BATCH; MICHELE  
JAWORSKI SUAREZ; MELANIE A. SHEKITA; MICHELLE SAVAGE; ERIC  
CRAIG CHASSE; LISA SELLERS; CHARLOTTE MITCHELL; WENDY  
KIRWAN; SONJI CARLTON; NANCEY BERSON; DR. SUSAN GARVEY;  
ROBERT B. RADAR; MARGARET EAGLES; RICHARD CROUTHARMEL; WAKE  
COUNTY GOVERNMENT; BATCH, POORE & WILLIAMS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

No. 14-2139

---

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE; STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; WAKE COUNTY  
NORTH CAROLINA MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT; TOWN OF CARY NORTH  
CAROLINA; SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith,  
Chief District Judge. (4:13-cv-00058-RBS-DEM; 4:13-cv-00007-  
RBS-DEM)

---

Submitted: May 28, 2015

Decided: June 25, 2015

---

Before GREGORY, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Nos. 14-1916 and 14-2139 dismissed; No. 14-1999 affirmed by  
unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Scott Davis, II, Appellant Pro Se. George Maralan  
Kelley, III, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk,  
Virginia; Roger Allen Askew, WAKE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,  
Raleigh, North Carolina; James Nicholas Ellis, POYNER SPRUILL  
LLP, Rocky Mount, North Carolina; Caroline P. Mackie, Lisa  
Patterson Sumner, POYNER SPRUILL LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina;  
Elizabeth A. Martineau, MARTINEAU KING PLLC, Charlotte, North  
Carolina; Peter Andrew Teumer, ROBEY TEUMER & DRASH, Norfolk,  
Virginia; Sydney J. Batch, BATCH, POORE & WILLIAMS, LLP,  
Raleigh, North Carolina; Joseph Tedford McFadden, Jr., RAWLS,  
MCNELIS & MITCHELL, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, William Scott Davis, Jr., challenges several district court orders. Although Davis' appeals arise from two distinct complaints filed in the district court, his claims in both cases generally arise from the events leading up to the termination of his parental rights and his attempts to challenge the termination. We dismiss the appeals in Nos. 14-1916 and 14-2139 for lack of jurisdiction. In No. 14-1999, we affirm the district court's orders.

In Nos. 14-1916 and 14-2139, Davis seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing three of five defendants from his complaint, in which he alleged claims under the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act, and disposing of numerous motions. 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 orders Davis seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss these two appeals for lack of jurisdiction.

In No. 14-1999, Davis appeals the district court's order granting Defendants' motions to dismiss and dismissing his amended complaint. We affirm this ruling. See Ashcroft v.

Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). Further, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying as futile Davis' motions for leave to amend his complaint. See Equal Rights Ctr. v. Niles Bolton Assocs., 602 F.3d 597, 603 (4th Cir. 2010). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders.

We deny all of Davis' pending motions. 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.

Nos. 14-1916 and 14-2139 DISMISSED  
No. 14-1999 AFFIRMED