Filed: 08/30/2018 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 407124981

## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
No. 18-1255
CELESTE G. BROUGHTON, a/k/a Celeste Gold Broughton,
Debtor - Appellant,
v.
BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, f/k/a The Bank of New York, as Trustee, on behalf of the holders of the Alternative Loan Trust 2006-41CB, Morgan Pass Through Certificates Series 2006-41CB; BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.; CITIBANK, N.A.; WAKE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
Creditors - Appellees,
ESTATE OF ROBERT BROUGHTON,
Appellee,
WALTER L. HINSON,
Trustee - Appellee.
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Martin K. Reidinger, District Judge. (5:16-cv-00302-RE)
Submitted: August 23, 2018 Decided: August 30, 2018
Before WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Appeal: 18-1255 Doc: 34 Filed: 08/30/2018 Pg: 2 of 3

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Celeste G. Broughton, Appellant Pro Se. William Sidney Aldridge, NICHOLLS & CRAMPTON, PA, Raleigh, North Carolina; Walter Lee Hinson, Jr., WALTER L. HINSON P.A., Wilson, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 18-1255 Doc: 34 Filed: 08/30/2018 Pg: 3 of 3

## PER CURIAM:

Celeste G. Broughton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her motions to reconsider several of the court's previous orders in Broughton's ongoing bankruptcy proceeding, and granting Broughton's request for an extension of time in which to seek reconsideration of other orders. 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, 545-46 (1949). The order Broughton seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction and deny Broughton's motion to amend the caption. 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**