Momolu Sirleaf v. David Robinson Appeal: 16-7357 Doc: 31

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

## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
No. 16-7357
MOMOLU V.S. SIRLEAF; ERIC L. PROSHA; JOHN KING; AARON LEWIS; PETER ROSAS; RYAN SESSOMS; RAY WATSON,
Plaintiffs - Appellants,
v.
DAVID ROBINSON; CURTIS WALL; M. VOSBURG; UNKNOWN HICKS; M. ROOK; UNKNOWN VARGO; D. WILMOUTH; UNKNOWN CREQUE; C. PARKER; HAROLD CLARK; M. FORBES,
Defendants - Appellees.
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, a Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, District Judge. (3:15-cv-00552-MHL-RCY)
Submitted: April 28, 2017 Decided: June 8, 2017
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and NIEMEYER and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.
Momolu V.S. Sirleaf, Eric L. Prosha, John King, Aaron Lewis, Peter Rosas, Ryan Sessoms and Ray Watson, Appellants Pro Se.

Doc. 406558513

Appeal: 16-7357 Doc: 31 Filed: 06/08/2017 Pg: 2 of 2

## PER CURIAM:

Appellants seek to appeal the district court's orders dismissing the claims of Aaron Lewis and Momolu V.S. Sirleaf without prejudice, and ordering that individual actions be opened for Eric L. Prosha, John King, Peter Rosas, Ryan Sessoms, and Ray Watson. 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 that Appellants seek to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we deny the pending motions and 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**