

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2421

JOHN HOWARD, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

STARSHA M. SEWELL,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Paul W. Grimm, District Judge. (8:15-cv-01539-PWG)

Submitted: April 11, 2016

Decided: April 14, 2016

Before DUNCAN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Starsha Sewell, Appellant Pro Se. David A. Wanger, LAW OFFICE OF DAVID WANGER, Annapolis, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Starsha Sewell appeals the district court's orders remanding this removed action to state court for lack of jurisdiction and denying the motion for reconsideration. An order remanding a case to state court is generally not reviewable on appeal or otherwise. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) (2012). The Supreme Court has limited the scope of § 1447(d), prohibiting appellate review of remand orders based on a defect in the removal procedure or lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co., 517 U.S. 706, 711-12 (1996); see 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) (2012). Here, remand was based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction. We deny the motion to transfer and 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