

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1414

CRISELL SEGUIN,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
BOARD; NORTHROP GRUMMAN SYSTEMS CORP.,

Respondents.

On Application for Enforcement of an Order of the United States Department of Labor
Administrative Review Board. (LABR-1:15-038; LABR-1:15-040; LABR-1:16-014)

Submitted: June 26, 2018

Decided: July 10, 2018

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Application dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Crisell Seguin, Petitioner Pro Se. Sarah Kay Marcus, Office of the Solicitor, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, Washington, D.C.; Lincoln Owens Bisbee, Peter David Larson, MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP, Washington, D.C.; Kelly Patrick Dunbar, David William Ogden, WILMERHALE LLP, Washington, D.C., for Respondents.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Citing Fed. R. App. P. 15(b), Petitioner Crisell Seguin has filed an application to enforce Respondent Department of Labor Administrative Review Board's order awarding Seguin attorney's fees and costs related to her whistleblower-retaliation complaint against Respondent Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation. Having reviewed the parties' submissions, we agree with Respondents that this Court lacks jurisdiction over Seguin's application. Contrary to Seguin's argument, in the absence of a "special statute conferring jurisdiction," Rule 15 is not a source of appellate jurisdiction. *Dew v. Hardin*, 432 F.2d 926, 926 (4th Cir. 1970) (per curiam). No statute confers jurisdiction on this Court to enforce the order in question. See 18 U.S.C. § 1514A(b)(2)(A) (2012); 49 U.S.C. § 42121(b)(6) (2012) (providing that jurisdiction over application for enforcement of final order of Secretary of Labor in whistleblower action is in appropriate district court). Accordingly, we deny Seguin's motion to appoint counsel and dismiss her Rule 15 application 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.

APPLICATION DISMISSED