

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6670

JOSEPH LAGANA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BOBBY SHEARIN, Warden; DR. COLLIN OHEY; DR. AVA JOUBEIT; PA GREG FLUIY; JANICE GILLMORE; ESTATE BARBARA NEWLON; RN BILL BEEMON; RN MONICA METHERY; RN KRISSY CORTEZ; RN CARLA BUCK; RN DAWN HAWK; LPN KELLY; LPN VICKIE; LPN MICHELLE; LT WILT; SGT ZAIG; LT M. YACENECH; CHRISTINE B.; JANETTE SIMMONS; CHAPLAIN LAMP; FRANK BISHOP, Warden; PA LUM; RN MARTIN; J. MICHAEL STOUFFER, Commission; SCOTT OAKLEY; SHARON BAUCOM; DR. GETACHEW; PATRICIA DOVE; RHONDA SKIDMORE; LPN JANE; PA GREG FLURY; LPN KIM; DR. ODIFIE; CORIZON, INC.; WEXFORD HEALTH; CMS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, Senior District Judge. (8:14-cv-00970-PJM)

Submitted: July 29, 2014

Decided: August 1, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph Lagana, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Joseph Lagana appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2).^{*} 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b) (2012). 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 Lagana may proceed with his timely claims by amending his complaint to provide a "short and plain" statement of the facts showing his entitlement to relief, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2), the order he seeks to appeal is neither a final order with respect to those claims nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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

^{*} Lagana does not contest on appeal the district court's dismissal with prejudice of his claims that were barred by the statute of limitations.

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED