

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 07-2148

---

CLAYTON CLEMONS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

J. N. BRADLEY, Corporal, South Carolina Highway Patrol; CHRIS SCALZO, Public Defender's Office; C. R. GARRETT, Judge, Greenville County Summary Court; PAUL B. WICKENSIMER, Greenville County Clerk of Court; ROBERT M. ARIAIL, Greenville County Solicitor; BARBARA H. TIFFIN, Assistant Solicitor; JOHN L. BREEDEN, Jr., Judge, Circuit Court Judge; JOSEPH L. SAVITZ, Chief Attorney, Division of Appellate Defense; KENNETH A. RICHSTAD, Clerk of South Carolina Court of Appeals; HAROLD MINCH COOMBS, Jr., Senior Assistant Attorney General; JASPER CURETON, AJ South Carolina Court of Appeals; KAYE GORENFLO HEARN, CJ South Carolina Court of Appeals; JEAN HOEFER TOAL, CJ South Carolina Supreme Court,

Defendants - Appellees,

v.

HENRY MCMASTER, Attorney General, South Carolina,

Third Party Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (6:07-cv-03286-GRA)

---

Submitted: June 19, 2008

Decided: June 23, 2008

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Clayton Clemons, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Clayton Clemons seeks to appeal the district court's order granting his motion to extend time to file objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and denying his motion to subpoena. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2000), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2000); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order Clemons seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED