

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1635

EVELYN W. SINGLETON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BETTY KILGUS, Member of the Bamberg County Registration and Election Commission and or the Bamberg County Board of Canvassers; DOROTHY LEE, member of the Bamberg County Registration and Election Commission and or the Bamberg County Board of Canvassers; JAMES M. GEORGE, member of the Bamberg County Registration and Election Commission and or the Bamberg County Board of Canvassers; VERLENE BOUCHAM, member of the Bamberg County Registration and Election Commission and or the Bamberg County Board of Canvassers; PATSY G. BLUME, member of the Bamberg County Registration and Election Commission and or the Bamberg County Board of Canvassers; ANDREW M. CARTER, SR.; SHERI S. SEIGLER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (CA-00-534-22-5)

Submitted: August 24, 2000

Decided: August 29, 2000

Before MICHAEL and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Russell Brown, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellant. Norma Anne Turner Jett, EARLY & NESS, Bamberg, South Carolina, for Appellees. Andrew M. Carter, Sr., Sheri S. Seigler, Appellees Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Evelyn W. Singleton appeals the district court's order remanding a civil case she removed from a South Carolina state court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441 (1994). Because the district court remanded the case on grounds expressly provided for in 28 U.S.C.A. § 1447(c) (West Supp. 2000) (defects in removal procedure or lack of subject matter jurisdiction), the remand order is not appealable under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) (1994). We therefore dismiss the appeal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. See id.; Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co., 517 U.S. 706, 711-12 (1996); Borneman v. United States, 213 F.3d 819, 824-25 (4th Cir. 2000). 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