

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1364

STEPHEN C. SIEBER, Movant/Debtor; DERRICK S. SIEBER,
Movant/Party in Interest; CHRISTOPHER PETITO,
Movant/Creditor; RONALD WILLIAMS, Movant/Creditor,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

CHARLES LANGDON, Movant/Creditor,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE WASHINGTON POST COMPANIES; ANGIE'S LIST; JEANNE CROUSE,
Assistant U.S. Trustee - Greenbelt; LEANDER BARNHILL,
Counsel for Assistant U.S. Trustee; CHERYL ROSE; JAMES
HOFFMAN, Special Counsel for Trustee; OFFIT/KIRMAN, Law Firm
of Trustee's Counsel; KEITH HAVENS; WILLIAMS AND CONNOLLY,
Law Firm for the Washington Post; CLARKSON MCDOW, Region IV
U.S. Trustee; ICE MILLER, LLP, Law Firm for Angie's List;
BRACEWELL AND GIULIANI, LLP, Second Law Firm for Angie's
List; PAUL POGUE, c/o Anthony H. Anikeef, Bracewell &
Guiliani, LLP; THOMAS MEADOWS, c/o Anthony H. Anikeef,
Bracewell & Guiliani, LLP; JOHN KELLY, c/o Kevin Hardy,
Williams & Connolly, LLP; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, c/o Todd
Kim, Esq.; ROBERT HARRIS, c/o Todd King, Esq.; JOHN POOLE,
c/o Christopher Hoge, Esq.; TODD JOHANNSEN, c/o Charles
Cate, Esq.; MONICA HAMMOCK, c/o Dale Sanders, Esq.,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, District Judge. (8:11-
cv-00758-RWT)

Submitted: September 29, 2011

Decided: October 4, 2011

Before KING, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stephen Charles Sieber, Derrick S. Sieber, Christopher Petito,
Ronald Williams, Appellants Pro Se. James Martin Hoffman, OFFIT
KURMAN, PA, Bethesda, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Appellants seek to appeal the district court's order denying their motion to withdraw the order of reference of Stephen Sieber's bankruptcy case to the bankruptcy court and denying Sieber's motion requesting the court to adopt his proposed order. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order the Appellants seek to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we deny Appellants' motion to consolidate this appeal with Appeal No. 11-1857, and we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED