

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7486**

---

STANLEY EARL CORBETT, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

CHARDAN WHITEHEAD; TIJUAN WILSON; SAMUEL MCCRAE; BILLY JOE  
RIDDLE; JOHN DAVIS; HASEEM EVERETT; JEROME PETERS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

G. J. BRANKER; SERGEANT PRADO; OFFICER LANCASTER; OFFICER  
HOLLOMAN; OFFICER HICKS; OFFICER JAMES; KENNETH LASSITER;  
MICHAEL NORRIS; BRENT SOUCIER; ARTHUR MARSH; OFFICER OATES;  
OFFICER BIDWELL; MARCEL COLLEYSMORE; OFFICER TYSON; OFFICER  
ALEXANDER,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SERGEANT REED; OFFICER MOORE; OFFICER PRESS; OFFICER  
SUMMERLIN; OFFICER LASSITER; JARED WELCH; BEN MORGAN;  
OFFICER HUNT,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle,  
District Judge. (5:13-ct-03201-BO)

---

Submitted: January 5, 2016

Decided: January 7, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stanley Earl Corbett, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Judith Maria Estevez, Assistant Attorney General, Donna Elizabeth Tanner, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stanley Earl Corbett, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order granting the Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to Corbett's claims in a civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012). 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). The order Corbett seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED