

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7375

RAYMOND V. BETHEL, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE SEX OFFENDER REGISTRY,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 14-7377

RAYMOND V. BETHEL, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE SEX OFFENDER REGISTRY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:14-cv-00170-HEH-MHL; 3:14-cv-00183-HEH-MHL)

Submitted: November 18, 2014

Decided: November 21, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Raymond V. Bethel, Jr., . Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Raymond V. Bethel, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing without prejudice his related actions filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (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). The orders Bethel seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders, as Bethel may be able to amend his respective complaints to cure the pleading deficiency identified by the district court.* See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we deny Bethel's motions to amend and dismiss the appeals 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

* Insofar as Bethel's motions to amend, filed in this court, seek to amend his § 1983 complaints, we note that such amendment must be sought in the district court. We express no opinion as to the effectiveness or propriety of his proposed amendments.