## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| ·  | No. 17-7178 |                            |
|--|-------------|----------------------------|
|  |             |                            |
| GEORGE FREDERICK DELANE  | ΞY,         |                            |
| Plaintiff - App  | pellant,    |                            |
| v.   |             |                            |
| BRANDON MULLEN, Sheriff Deputy, sued individually and in his official capacity; JACOB T. MCNAMARA, Sheriff Deputy, sued individually and in his official capacity; KENNETH STOLLE, Sheriff, sued individually and in his official capacity; YOLANDA VINES, R.N., sued individually and in her official capacity; ELIZIBETH NICHOLSON, L.P.N., sued individually and in her official capacity; M. BAPTISTE, Sheriff Deputy, sued individually and in his or her official capacity; B. ORCHARD, Sheriff Deputy, sued individually and in his or her official capacity, |             |                            |
| Defendants - A   | Appellees.  |                            |
| Appeal from the United States I<br>Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Sei   |             |                            |
| Submitted: November 21, 2017   |             | Decided: November 28, 2017 |
| Before WYNN and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.   |             |                            |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curi  | am opinion. |                            |
| George Frederick Delaney, Appell   | ant Pro Se. |                            |

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

George Frederick Delaney seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action against some, but not all, Defendants. 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 order Delaney seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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**