

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2409

CATHY D. BROOKS-MCCOLLUM; SAMUEL J. MCCOLLUM,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

THE RESERVE @ ELK RIVER, with permission of the Court upon
indemnification ruling and within corporate document,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE FARM INSURANCE COMPANY; JEFF BEAM; ERIC HAVERSACK;
DARLENE RENDEK; STUART MOULTRIE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District
Judge. (1:13-cv-02025-JFM)

Submitted: March 25, 2014

Decided: April 11, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Cathy D. Brooks-McCollum; Samuel J. McCollum, Appellants Pro Se.
Melissa Dyan McNair, BUDOW & NOBLE, PC, Bethesda, Maryland; Erin

Kathleen Voss, NAGLE & ZALLER PC, Columbia, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Cathy D. Brooks-McCollum and Samuel J. McCollum appeal the district court's order dismissing Appellants' civil complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny all of Appellants' motions that are not for an extension of time,¹ deny Appellees' motions to strike, grant all outstanding motions for extension of time,² and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. McCollum v. State Farm Ins. Co., No. 1:13-cv-02025-JFM (D. Md. Nov. 18, 2013). 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.

AFFIRMED

¹ To the extent that Appellants seek a writ of mandamus asking us to overturn a decision of a Maryland state administrative law judge, we do not have jurisdiction to grant mandamus relief against state officials. Gurley v. Superior Court of Mecklenburg Cnty., 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969).

² The Appellants and Appellees have each filed motions to permit late filing or to extend the time for filing informal briefs. Although no orders acting on these motions have been entered, it appears that the pertinent pleadings have, in fact, been filed. So that the record is clear that we have considered all submissions by all parties, all outstanding motions for extension of time are granted nunc pro tunc.