

FILED: October 4, 2021

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 21-155  
(2:20-cv-00004-BHH-MHC)

---

C. HOLMES

Petitioner

v.

BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA, INC.; J. DOE #1  
THROUGH J. DOE #X; SCOTT MCCARTHA; MS. SHIPMAN

Respondents

---

O R D E R

---

The court denies the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc. No judge requested a poll under Fed. R. App. P. 35 on the petition for rehearing en banc.

Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge King, Judge Thacker, and Senior Judge Traxler.

For the Court

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 21-155**

---

C. HOLMES,

Petitioner,

v.

BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA, INC.; J. DOE #1  
THROUGH J. DOE #X; SCOTT MCCARTHA; MS. SHIPMAN,

Respondents.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Charleston. Bruce H. Hendricks, District Judge. (2:20-cv-00004-BHH-MHC)

---

Submitted: June 24, 2021

Decided: June 29, 2021

---

Before KING and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

C. Holmes, Petitioner Pro Se. James Whittington Clement, James B. Hood, HOOD LAW  
FIRM, Charleston, South Carolina, for Respondents.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

C. Holmes petitions for permission to appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) the district court's orders denying her motion for a de novo determination by an Article III judge and denying reconsideration. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292. Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). In order to be reviewed, the interlocutory orders must be certified by the district court in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Because the district court did not certify the orders, we deny Holmes' petition for permission to 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.

*PETITION DENIED*