UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1182

LAMAR A. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PAUL M. MAYHEW, Individual Capacity & Official Capacity; SUZANNE T.
BERGER, Individual Capacity & Official Capacity; MICHAEL E. FIELD,
Individual Capacity & Official Capacity; ANDREW MAGGIO, Individual Capacity
& Official Capacity; JENNIFER R. FRANKOVICH, Individual Capacity & Official
Capacity; KEVIN B. KAMENETZ, Individual Capacity & Official Capacity;
LAWRENCE M. STAHL; JAMES G. BEACH, III; BALTIMORE COUNTY
COUNCIL; TERRENCE B. SHERIDAN, in his individual and/or his official
capacity; MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Ellen Lipton Hollander, Senior District Judge. (1:18-cv-03545-ELH)

Submitted: June 28, 2022   Decided: June 30, 2022

Before NIEMEYER and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lamar A. Williams, Appellant Pro Se.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lamar A. Williams seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion to amend the scheduling order in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Appellees move to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. 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). The order Williams seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we grant the Appellees' motion and dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. Additionally, we deny Williams' emergency motion for a stay pending appeal and grant his motion for an extension of time to respond to the Appellees' motion to dismiss. 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