UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1880

ROSA SANDOVAL,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

STARWEST SERVICES, LLC; EHAB KHALIL; TARIQ ALGAILY,

Defendants - Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Anthony John Trenga, District Judge. (1:17-cv-01053-AJT-TCB)

Submitted: March 19, 2019

Decided: March 27, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kellie M.L. Budd, Abigail S. Reigle, DOUMAR MARTIN PLLC, Arlington, Virginia, for Appellants. Randall Sousa, LAW OFFICES OF RANDALL SOUSA, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Starwest Services, LLC, Ehab Khalil, and Tariq Algaily ("the defendants") appeal from the district court's order finding, after a bench trial, that they willfully violated Rosa Sandoval's rights under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201–219, and entering a \$25,508 judgment in her favor. After reviewing the record, however, we note that the district court did not adjudicate Sandoval's state law claims for breach of contract, unjust enrichment, and quantum meruit.

Our jurisdiction generally extends to review only final orders, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949), and the district court's order is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order, *see Porter v. Zook*, 803 F.3d 694, 696-97 (4th Cir. 2015). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and remand the case to the district court to allow the district court to consider Sandoval's state law claims. We also dismiss as premature Sandoval's motions for attorney's fees.

We grant Sandoval's motion to submit the case on the briefs and 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

2