

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7852

LARNELL HENDRICK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WEXFORD HEALTH SOURCES, INC.; FRANK B. BISHOP, NBCI Warden,
In their individual and Official Capacities; LIEUTENANT
SAWYERS, In their individual and Official Capacities;
SERGEANT G. FORNEY, In their individual and Official
Capacities; CO II SOLTAS, In their individual and Official
Capacities; CO II ANDERSON, In their individual and
Official Capacities; BILL BEEMAN, NBCI Medical Director, In
their individual and Official Capacities,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Theodore D. Chuang, District Judge.
(8:14-cv-02544-TDC)

Submitted: April 13, 2015

Decided: April 15, 2015

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam
opinion.

Larnell Hendrick, Appellant Pro Se. Gina Marie Smith, MEYERS,
RODBELL & ROSENBAUM, PA, Riverdale, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Larnell Hendrick seeks to appeal the district court's order: denying his motions for preliminary injunction and for appointment of counsel; and granting his motions to correct the record and to amend the complaint in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action. We affirm in part and dismiss in part.

We review the denial of a motion for a preliminary injunction for abuse of discretion. WV Ass'n of Club Owners & Fraternal Servs., Inc. v. Musgrave, 553 F.3d 292, 298 (4th Cir. 2009). We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in finding that Hendrick failed to make the showing required for issuance of a preliminary injunction. See Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). We therefore affirm the portion of the district court's order denying the requested injunction for the reasons stated by the district court. Hendrick v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., No. 8:14-cv-02544-TDC (D. Md. Nov. 21, 2014).

With respect to the remainder of the district court's order, 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 non-dispositive orders denying the motion for appointment of counsel and granting the motions to amend the

complaint and to correct the record are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of the appeal.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART