Joseph W. Verrett, Sr. v. General Motors Automotive Appeal: 16-7214 Doc: 15 Filed: 04/03/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 406465710

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7214

JOSEPH W. VERRETT, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GENERAL MOTORS AUTOMOTIVE GROUP,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:15-cv-00416-HEH-RCY)

Submitted: March 30, 2017 Decided: April 3, 2017

Before TRAXLER and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph W. Verrett, Sr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Joseph W. Verrett, Sr., seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(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 Verrett may be able to remedy the deficiencies identified by the district court by filing an amended complaint stating sufficient facts to support his claims, the order Verrett seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Goode v. Central Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, 807 F.3d 619, 623-24 (4th Cir. 2015); 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 and remand the case to the district court with instructions to allow Verrett to file an amended complaint. 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 AND REMANDED