UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
_	No. 20-1853	
CHESTER A. YATES,		
Plaintiff - App	pellant,	
v.		
MUTUAL OF OMAHA INSURAL	NCE COMPANY,	
Defendant - A	ppellee.	
Appeal from the United States Dist Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Sen		
Submitted: November 19, 2020	_	Decided: November 23, 2020
Before WILKINSON, KING, and	QUATTLEBAUM, (Circuit Judges.
Dismissed and remanded by unpub	lished per curiam op	inion.
Chester A. Yates, Appellant Pro SULLIVAN, PLLC, Raleigh, North	_	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Chester A. Yates seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). "Ordinarily, a district court order is not final until it has resolved *all* claims as to all parties." *Porter v. Zook*, 803 F.3d 694, 696 (4th Cir. 2015) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Our review of the record reveals that the district court did not adjudicate all of the claims raised in the complaint. *See id.* at 696-97. Specifically, the district court failed to address Yates' allegations of harassment and intimidation and his allegations regarding theft of renewals and clients—allegations that go beyond simple termination of his contract. We conclude that the order Yates seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and remand to the district court for consideration of the unresolved claims. *Id.* at 699.

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 AND REMANDED