Freddie Riley v. Ed McMahon Appeal: 15-6934 Doc: 14 Filed: 10/20/2015 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6934

FREDDIE LEE RILEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

JACQUES CHAVIS; RICK EDWARD TOSCANO; JOEL WOODS,

Movants,

v.

SHERIFF ED MCMAHON; DR. STUBBS; OFFICER CHAPPELL,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III, Chief District Judge. (5:14-ct-03243-D)

Submitted: October 15, 2015 Decided: October 20, 2015

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Freddie Lee Riley, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405673084

Appeal: 15-6934 Doc: 14 Filed: 10/20/2015 Pg: 2 of 2

PER CURIAM:

Freddie Lee Riley seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. With regard to Riley's appeal of the district court's dismissal without prejudice of his claim of injury to his arm, 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, 545-47 (1949). "Dismissals without prejudice are generally not appealable final In re GNC Corp., 789 F.3d 505, 511 n.3 (4th Cir. 2015). Because the deficiencies in this claim identified by the district court may be remedied by the filing of an amended complaint, we dismiss this portion of the appeal interlocutory. See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993).

As to Riley's remaining claims, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the remainder of the district court's order. Riley v. McMahon, No. 5:14-ct-03243-D (E.D.N.C. June 1, 2015). 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART; DISMISSED IN PART