

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 96-6275**

---

JONATHAN IDEMA; PATRICIA DAWN GLOSSON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

J. T. HADDEN; PHILLIP WISE; JOHN HAHN, Warden;  
JANET RENO, Attorney General of the United  
States,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 96-6629**

---

JONATHAN IDEMA; PATRICIA DAWN GLOSSON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

J. T. HADDEN; PHILLIP WISE; JOHN HAHN, Warden;  
JANET RENO, Attorney General of the United  
States,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

No. 96-6722

---

JONATHAN IDEMA; PATRICIA DAWN GLOSSON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

J. T. HADDEN; PHILLIP WISE; JOHN HAHN, Warden;  
JANET RENO, Attorney General of the United  
States,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, District  
Judge. (CA-95-610-5-BR)

---

Submitted: July 23, 1996

Decided: July 31, 1996

---

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jonathan Idema, Patricia Dawn Glosson, Appellants Pro Se. Charles  
Edwin Hamilton, III, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh,  
North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Appellants appeal from the district court's order dismissing without prejudice their 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (1988) action for failure to particularize their complaint (No. 96-6275) and denying their motion to reconsider the dismissal (No. 96-6722). Because a dismissal without prejudice is generally not appealable, we dismiss the appeals. See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). Finally, since Appellants have been granted in forma pauperis status on appeal, we dismiss as moot Appellants' appeal of the district court's order directing them to properly complete an in forma pauperis application for purposes of appeal (No. 96-6629). 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