## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•	<del></del>
	No. 21-155
C. HOLMES,	
Petitioner,	
v.	
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD THROUGH J. DOE #X; SCOTT N	OF SOUTH CAROLINA, INC.; J. DOE #1 MCCARTHA; MS. SHIPMAN,
Respondents.	
Charleston. Bruce H. Hendricks, I	District Court for the District of South Carolina, at District Judge. (2:20-cv-00004-BHH-MHC)
Submitted: June 24, 2021	Decided: June 29, 2021
Before KING and THACKER, Cir	cuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.
Petition denied by unpublished per	curiam opinion.
C. Holmes, Petitioner Pro Se. Jam FIRM, Charleston, South Carolina	es Whittington Clement, James B. Hood, HOOD LAW, for Respondents.
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

C. Holmes petitions for permission to appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) the district court's orders denying her motion for a de novo determination by an Article III judge and denying reconsideration. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292. Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). In order to be reviewed, the interlocutory orders must be certified by the district court in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Because the district court did not certify the orders, we deny Holmes' petition for permission to appeal. 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.

PETITION DENIED