

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-1431

AUBREY J. EL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, Gina Raimondo, Secretary,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (2:18-cv-00190-RGD-DEM)

Submitted: November 23, 2021

Decided: November 29, 2021

Before NIEMEYER, FLOYD, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Aubrey J. El, Appellant Pro Se. Joel Eric Wilson, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Aubrey J. El appeals the district court's orders denying his motion to amend his amended complaint and denying his third motion for a preliminary injunction. 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). "A denial of a motion to amend a complaint is not a final order, nor is it an appealable interlocutory or collateral order." *Bridges v. Dep't of Md. State Police*, 441 F.3d 197, 206 (4th Cir. 2006). We therefore dismiss for lack of jurisdiction El's appeal to the extent that he appeals the denial of his motion to amend the amended complaint.

As for El's appeal of the denial of his third motion for a preliminary injunction, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. *See Mountain Valley Pipeline, LLC v. W. Pocahontas Props. Ltd. P'ship*, 918 F.3d 353, 366 (4th Cir. 2019) (providing preliminary injunction standards). We therefore affirm the district court's order denying El's third motion for a preliminary injunction. *El v. United States Dep't of Com.*, No. 2:18-cv-00190-RGD-DEM (E.D. Va. Mar. 25, 2021). 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.

*AFFIRMED IN PART,
DISMISSED IN PART*