

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-1535

ALI BEHROZ AZIZ; SHINKAY AZIZ,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; MARYLAND ATTORNEY GENERAL;
BEZHAN AZIZ; JOHNATHON KAGEN; MONTGOMERY COUNTY POLICE
DEPARTMENT; BRANDON MENGEDOHI, Detective; MARC J. ERME,
Captain; JOHN MCCARTHY, State's Attorney for Montgomery County,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Adam B. Abelson, District Judge. (1:26-cv-00243-ABA)

Submitted: June 5, 2026

Decided: June 18, 2026

Before NIEMEYER and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ali Behroz Aziz, Shinkay Aziz, Appellants Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ali Behroz Aziz and Shinkay Aziz (“Plaintiffs”) seek to appeal the district court’s March 30, 2026, order granting a defendant’s motion to seal; April 9, 2026, order denying Plaintiffs’ various motions, including their motions for the appointment of counsel, to vacate the sealing order, and to strike the defendant’s sealed motion to dismiss; and April 27, 2026, order denying Plaintiffs’ other motions, including their motions for recusal, to reconsider the denial of their motion for the appointment of counsel, and to convert the motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment. 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). The orders Plaintiffs seek to appeal are not final orders or appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

* To the extent Plaintiffs assert that the district court certified its orders for immediate appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), there is no certification order on the district court’s docket. Insofar as Plaintiffs request mandamus relief, we conclude that they have not shown a clear and indisputable right to such relief. *See In re Braxton*, 258 F.3d 250, 261 (4th Cir. 2001).