Jeffrey Cohen v. Rod Rosenstein Appeal: 16-7313 Doc: 10

Filed: 06/08/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

	TATES COURT OF THE FOURTH CIRO	
	No. 16-7313	
JEFFREY BRIAN COHEN,		
Plaintiff - App	pellant,	
v.		
ROD J. ROSENSTEIN, US Attorney; JOYCE KALLAM MCI	•	
Defendants - A	Appellees.	
Appeal from the United States Dist William M. Nickerson, Senior Dist		
Submitted: May 31, 2017		Decided: June 8, 2017
Before NIEMEYER, WYNN, and	HARRIS, Circuit Ju	dges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
Jeffrey Brian Cohen, Appellant Pro STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore,		•
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

Doc. 406558579

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey Brian Cohen seeks to appeal the district court's order staying his civil suit against federal prosecutors pending resolution of his criminal direct appeal, as well as its order granting in part and denying in part Cohen's motion for reconsideration. As a threshold inquiry to any appeal, we are obliged to satisfy ourselves of our jurisdiction to hear the matter. See Clark v. Cartledge, 829 F.3d 303, 305 (4th Cir. 2016); United States v. Bullard, 645 F.3d 237, 246 (4th Cir. 2011). We 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 Cohen seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. See Moses H. Cone Mem'l Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp., 460 U.S. 1, 11 n.11 (1983); Amdur v. Lizars, 372 F.2d 103, 105-06 (4th Cir. 1967). 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 before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED