UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6644

NEKITA ANTONIO WHITE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DUNN, Correctional Officer; TWINE, Correctional Officer; ROBERTS, Correctional Officer; CARLENS, Correctional Officer; MCQUEEN, Correctional Officer; MOJET, Correctional Officer; JACKSON, Correctional Officer; MASKELUNY, Correctional Officer; PARHAM, Correctional Officer; WHALENS, Correctional Officer; PIEARCE, Correctional Officer; RAWLINGS, Correctional Officer; EZELL, Correctional Officer; MOFFET, Correctional Officer,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T.S. Ellis, III, Senior District Judge. (1:10-cv-00349-TSE-IDD)

Submitted: July 28, 2011 Decided: August 2, 2011

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nekita Antonio White, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nekita Antonio White seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint for failure to follow the court's earlier order requiring him to particularize and amend his complaint. 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, 545-46 (1949). Because White's complaint lacked specificity and he failed to remedy this fact by filing an amended complaint that articulated adequate facts, we conclude that the order White seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Generally a district court's dismissal without prejudice is not appealable. See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066 (4th Cir. 1993) (holding that a plaintiff may not appeal the dismissal of his complaint without prejudice unless the grounds for dismissal clearly indicate that no amendment in the complaint could cure the defects in the plaintiff's case). 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