## United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-40831 Summary Calendar United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 30, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

Anson Chi,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas USDC No. 4:12-CR-155-1

\_\_\_\_\_

Before KING, HAYNES, and Ho, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Anson Chi, federal prisoner # 44588-177, appeals the district court's denial of his motion for an extension of time to file a motion for the transfer of property pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 41(g). However, we "must examine the basis of [our] jurisdiction, on [our] own motion, if necessary." *Mosley v. Cozby*, 813 F.2d 659, 660 (5th Cir. 1987).

\* This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

## No. 24-40831

The order denying Chi's motion for an extension of time to file a motion for the transfer of property was not a final decision. See 28 U.S.C. § 1291; Midland Asphalt Corp. v. United States, 489 U.S. 794, 798 (1989); Mohawk Indus., Inc. v. Carpenter, 558 U.S. 100, 103 (2009). The order also does not fall within any jurisprudential exception, such as the collateral-order doctrine, that would render it a final, appealable order. See Goodman v. Harris Cnty., 443 F.3d 464, 467-69 (5th Cir. 2006). The order likewise does not fall into the classes of interlocutory decisions listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1292 over which courts of appeal have jurisdiction, and it was not certified for appeal by the district court pursuant to § 1292(b) or Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b). Thus, we lack jurisdiction over the instant appeal. See Dardar v. Lafourche Realty Co., Inc., 849 F.2d 955, 957-59 (5th Cir. 1988); Save the Bay, Inc. v. United States Army, 639 F.2d 1100, 1102-03 & n.3 (5th Cir. 1981).

Accordingly, Chi's appeal is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction. His motion to amend his reply brief is DENIED.