

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1176

US BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRACIE L. GREEN, a/k/a Tracie Ledora Mitchem-Green,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

CARDINAL PINES HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.; PALMETTO
CITIZENS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Columbia. Sherri A. Lydon, District Judge. (3:22-cv-04215-SAL)

Submitted: September 28, 2023

Decided: October 2, 2023

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tracie L. Green, Appellant Pro Se. John S. Kay, HUTCHENS LAW FIRM, Columbia,
South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tracie L. Green seeks to appeal the district court’s order adopting the magistrate judge’s recommendation and remanding Appellee’s action against her to the state court from which it was removed. The district court remanded the case after determining that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction. “Congress has placed broad restrictions on the power of federal appellate courts to review district court orders remanding removed cases to state court.” *Doe v. Blair*, 819 F.3d 64, 66 (4th Cir. 2016) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) (providing that remand orders generally are “not reviewable on appeal or otherwise”). Section 1447(d) prohibits us from reviewing remand orders based on the grounds specified in § 1447(c), including “a district court’s lack of subject matter jurisdiction.” *Ellenburg v. Spartan Motors Chassis, Inc.*, 519 F.3d 192, 196 (4th Cir. 2008) (internal quotation marks omitted). We look to the substance of a remand order to determine whether it was issued under § 1447(c). *Doe*, 819 F.3d at 67.

Here, the district court remanded the case after having expressly determined that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction. We are therefore without jurisdiction to review the remand order. *See id.* at 66. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny Green’s motion to seal documents. 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