

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-7361**

---

MOMOLU V.S. SIRLEAF,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DAVID ROBINSON, Chief of Operations, VDOC, sued individually and in official capacity; WALL, Prison Chaplin, GRCC, in official and individual capacity; HAROLD CLARK, Director, VADOC, in his official and individual capacity; EDDIE PEARSON, Warden, GRCC, in his official and individual capacity; CAROLINE PARKER, Warden, GRCC, in her official and individual capacity; D. WILMOUTH, Warden, GRCC, in his official and individual capacity; VARGO, Warden, GRCC, in her official and individual capacity; KEEFFE, GRCC, in his official and individual capacity; COLONEL JARRATT, Supervising Guard, GRCC/VADOC, in his official and individual capacity; GRACE, GRCC, in his/her official and individual capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, District Judge. (3:15-cv-00339-MHL-RCY)

---

Submitted: February 7, 2017

Decided: February 14, 2017

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and NIEMEYER and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Momolu V.S. Sirleaf, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Momolu V.S. Sirleaf seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his civil action without prejudice and giving him an opportunity to reinstate his action. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders of the district court, 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 Sirleaf seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. See Goode v. Central Va. Legal Aid, 807 F.3d 619, 623 (4th Cir. 2015). Accordingly, we deny the pending motion 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