## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

		•
	No. 17-1978	
DIANE ROSENBERG; MARK MEYER; JOHN A. ANSELL, III; KENNETH SAVITZ; JENNIFER ROCHINO; CAROLINE FIELDS,		
Plaintiffs - Ap	ppellees,	
v.		
DIANNA FORD,		
Defendant - A	appellant.	
Appeal from the United States Di Theodore D. Chuang, District Judg		•
Submitted: November 16, 2017		Decided: November 20, 2017
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	and TRAXLER and I	KEENAN, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
Dianna Ford, Appellant Pro Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.		

## PER CURIAM:

Dianna Ford has noted an appeal from the district court's order remanding a removed foreclosure action to Maryland state court. "[A] district court may remand a case *sua sponte* for lack of subject matter jurisdiction at any time, 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) [(2012)], and such an order is not reviewable, *id.* § 1447(d)." *Doe v. Blair*, 819 F.3d 64, 66-67 (4th Cir. 2016). The district court remanded Ford's removed action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, explaining that the complaint did not present a federal question and that diversity of citizenship was lacking. Because the district court remanded the action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, we lack jurisdiction to review its order. *Id.* Accordingly, we dismiss the 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.

**DISMISSED**