

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-6218

JAMES EDWARD ROSE, JR.,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; BERKELEY COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE;
HILL-FINKLEA DETENTION CENTER; R. MARKLEY DENNIS, JR.; DEADRA
L. JEFFERSON; WILTON MCNEELY; BRANDON D. LATULLIP; T. DODD;
BERKELEY COUNTY JAIL KEEPERS; RONNIE J. RUSSEL; PAULA
FEHELM MCELVEGUE; B. WATSON; HENRY’S TOWING; HENRY
LEGETTE; BAD BOYZ BAIL BONDS; MARIE FULLER; BO WILSON; RANDY
DEMORY; ANTHONY PHYALL; KRIS JACUMIN; SERGEANT DOZER;
OFFICER STALEY; K. SHULER; DEBRA K. LITTLEJOHN; JUDGE
PRIOLEAU; OFFICER A. LIZZONO; GARY WASIELEUSKI,

Defendants – Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Charleston. J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (2:21-cv-02909-JMC)

Submitted: May 19, 2022

Decided: May 24, 2022

Before MOTZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Edward Rose, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Edward Rose, Jr., a pretrial detainee, appeals the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his civil rights action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).^{*} We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Rose v. South Carolina*, No. 2:21-cv-02909-JMC (D.S.C. Feb. 11, 2022). We deny Rose's motion for appointment of counsel. 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.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Because the defect identified by the district court—failure to prosecute or comply with a court order—is “unrelated to the contents of the pleadings,” we conclude that the district court's order is final and appealable. *Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc’y, Inc.*, 807 F.3d 619, 624 (4th Cir. 2015), *abrogated in part on other grounds by Bing v. Brivo Sys., LLC*, 959 F.3d 605, 611-12 (4th Cir. 2020) (discussing factors this court considers in determining whether order is final and appealable), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 1376 (2021).