

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6159**

---

CHRISTOPHER ODOM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, #950R1005342; Claim Date 10-29-10; Judge Garfinkel, seal on 10-29-10; STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TAXPAYERS; PEOPLE OF CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS; CHARLESTON COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE; SHERIFF AL CANNON EMPLOYEES; SHERIFF AL CANNON; SHERIFF AL CANNON DETENTION CENTER; CITY OF CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS, Mayor Riley; CITY OF N. CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS, Mayor K. Summey; CITY OF CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF N. CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, SC; SOG, of Sheriff Al Cannon Detention Center; GOVERNOR NICKKI HALEY; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH; G. WERBER BRYAN PSYCHOLOGICAL HOSPITAL; DR. FERLANTO, MUSC; DR. GRISWALD, MUSC; CRAFTS FARROW STATE HOSPITAL; SCDMH EMPLOYEES; SCDMH STAFF; SCDMH SECURITY; DHEC; CHAMPUS; THE MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA; JUST CARE INCORPORATED; GEO; CHARLESTON COUNTY SOLICITORS OFFICE; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, various case numbers; FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, various case numbers; UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, various case numbers; SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS, various case numbers; DR. RUSSELL KEITH; J. BENNICIE; THE DEFENDANTS LIABILITY INSURANCE POLICYHOLDER; ALAN WILSON, Attorney General of South Carolina; ALBERT PIERCE, Atty of SCDMH; SOUTH CAROLINA TAXPAYERS/SC STATE TREASURY,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (5:13-cv-02632-RMG)

---

Submitted: May 29, 2014

Decided: June 3, 2014

---

Before SHEDD, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher A. Odom, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher A. Odom seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss without prejudice his civil 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, 545-47 (1949). The order Odom seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order because it is possible for him to cure the pleading deficiencies in the complaint that were identified by the district court. Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993) (holding that order dismissing complaint without prejudice is final and appealable only if "no amendment [in the complaint] could cure the defects in the plaintiff's case" (internal quotation marks omitted)); see also Chao v. Rivendell Woods, Inc., 415 F.3d 342, 345 (4th Cir. 2005) (explaining that, under Domino Sugar, this court must "examine the appealability of a dismissal without prejudice based on the specific facts of the case in order to guard against piecemeal litigation and repetitive appeals"). 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