

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 19-1633

MICHAEL OSEI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, (“UMUC”); THE
OFFICE OF FINANCIAL AID, UMUC; JAVIER MIYARES; JULIE
LINDENMEIER; CLAIRBOURNE W. PATTY; TERRENCE COOPER;
LYNETTE O’LEARY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:15-cv-02502-DKC)

Submitted: May 11, 2020

Decided: May 28, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and RICHARDSON and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit
Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Osei, Appellant Pro Se. Erik James Delfosse, Christopher Bowie Lord, OFFICE
OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Osei filed a complaint against the University of Maryland University College (UMUC), its financial aid office, and several UMUC employees. The district court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim without addressing Osei's request for leave to amend his complaint. We vacated the court's dismissal order and remanded to allow the court to decide whether leave to amend should be granted. The court denied Osei's motion for leave to amend with prejudice, and Osei seeks to appeal that order.

This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2018), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2018); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). Although the district court has denied Osei leave to amend with prejudice, our prior vacatur of the dismissal order means that the original complaint and Defendants' motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim are still pending.

Because the order Osei seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny Osei's motion to assign the appeal to the prior panel. 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