

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-14425
Non-Argument Calendar

In re: ELIZABETH K. RICHERT,

Debtor.

ELIZABETH K. RICHERT,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

THOMAS WHITE,
KATHLEEN WHITE MURPHY,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 1:25-cv-23722-EA

Before JORDAN, LUCK, and BRASHER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Elizabeth K. Richert, proceeding pro se, appeals from the district court's order denying her motion for leave to appeal and dismissing her appeal from the bankruptcy court's orders denying summary judgment and reconsideration in an adversary proceeding. Appellees Thomas White and Kathleen White Murphy move to dismiss Richert's appeal for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that the bankruptcy orders are interlocutory and that the district court declined to review the non-final orders. Richert responds that we have jurisdiction over her appeal to address the fraud perpetrated by Appellees on the bankruptcy and district courts.

We conclude that we lack jurisdiction over Richert's appeal because neither the district court's nor bankruptcy court's orders are final. See 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(1); *Mich. State Univ. v. Asbestos Settlement Tr. (In re Celotex Corp.)*, 700 F.3d 1262, 1265 (11th Cir. 2012) (explaining that for a court of appeals to have jurisdiction under § 158(d), both the district court and the bankruptcy court must have issued final orders). The bankruptcy court's orders denying summary judgment and reconsideration are not final because they do not resolve any claim, controversy, or adversary proceeding. See *Barben v. Donovan (In re Donovan)*, 532 F.3d 1134, 1136-37 (11th Cir. 2008) (explaining that, in the bankruptcy context, we generally have jurisdiction over only final orders and judgments, which finally resolve a particular adversary proceeding, controversy, or claim); *Smith v. First Nat'l Bank of Albany (In re Smith)*, 735 F.2d 459,

25-14425

Opinion of the Court

3

461 (11th Cir. 1984) (explaining that a bankruptcy court order denying summary judgment in an adversary proceeding is not a final order). The district court's order denying Richert's motion for leave to appeal and dismissing her appeal is similarly non-final, as it merely declined to review the interlocutory orders and remanded the matter to the bankruptcy court for further proceedings. See *In re Celotex Corp.*, 700 F.3d at 1265-66 (explaining that a district court's order declining to exercise jurisdiction over an interlocutory appeal is not a final order that is immediately appealable to this Court because it does not end litigation on the merits).

Accordingly, Appellees' motion to dismiss is GRANTED, and this appeal is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction.