UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7645

CHRISTOPHER ODOM,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TAXPAYERS; CITY OF CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS; CITY OF NORTH CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS; CARTA BUS; COUNTY OF CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS; CHARLESTON COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE; SHERIFF AL CANNON EMPLOYEES; SHERIFF AL CANNON; SHERIFF AL CANNON DETENTION CENTER; CITY OF CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF NORTH CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES; SOG, of Sheriff Al Cannon Detention Center; GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH; G. WERBER BRYAN PSYCHOLOGICAL HOSPITAL; DR. FERLANTO; DR. GRISWALD; CRAFTS FARROW STATE HOSPITAL; SCDMH EMPLOYEES; SCDMH STAFF; SCDMH SECURITY; DHEC; CHAMPUS; MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA; JUST CARE; GEO; CHARLESTON COUNTY SOLICITORS OFFICE; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT; FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS; UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT; SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS; DR. RUSSELL KEITH; J. BENNICE; DEFENDANTS LIABILITY INSURANCE POLICYHOLDER; ALAN WILSON; ALBERT PIERCE; SC STATE TREASURY; SCDMH HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (5:14-cv-02441-RMG)

Submitted: March 23, 2015 Decided: April 2, 2015

Before AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher A. Odom, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Odom appeals the district court's order adopting in part the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing without prejudice Odom's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). Because Odom may proceed with his claims by filing another complaint and providing factual allegations specifying how the named defendants violated his constitutional rights, the order he seeks to appeal is neither a final order with respect to those claims nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny Odom's motion to amend his claim. 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