UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1200

RAMON CHARLES CHAPMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JUDGE CHRISTINE BENAUGH, Hearings and Appeals Judge; LAURIE WATKINS, Social Security Reg. Commissioner Hpt, Va. Hampton, Va. Branch Office; R. KING, Disability Analyst, Va. Beach, Va. Office; EDWARD DILLARD, VCU Medical Center/Richmond, VA; DR. ISAACS, VCU Medical Center/Richmond, Va.; BRENDA BAGLEY, Supervisor/Commonwealth of Virginia Office of Licensure and Certification; AMANDA DODD, VCU Medical Center Patient Liaison; MAND G. DODD, MBA VCU Medical Center Operation Manager; NATALIE OPIE-DAWSON, Case holder Counselor of Department of Rehabilitation Service Hampton North Office II; DOLORES HEISLE, M.S., CRC, LPC/Rehabilitation Counselor/Richmond, Va. Dept. of Rehability Service; LINDA DOUGHERTY, Private Practice Mental Health of Richmond, Va.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Mark S. Davis, District Judge. (4:11-cv-00024-MSD-TEM)

Submitted: July 28, 2011 Decided: August 1, 2011

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ramon Charles Chapman, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ramon Charles Chapman seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his complaint without prejudice for failure to state a jurisdictional basis for any federal claims and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any state claims. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order Chapman seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1067 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED