

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-2561**

---

ARMANDO DESPAIGNE ZULVETA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE AUTOMOBILE MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY; PHILPOT LAW FIRM,  
PA; TC UNLIMITED INCORPORATED; STEADMAN HAWKINS CLINIC OF  
THE CAROLINAS; WILSON JONES CARTER & BAXLEY PA; ROBERT P.  
RESTREPO, JR.; STEPHEN R. BRUNER; IRVIN H. PHILPOT, III; TIM  
CASE; CURTIS ELLIOT; WESLEY J. SHULL,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior  
District Judge. (6:15-cv-02880-HMH-KFM)

---

Submitted: August 12, 2016

Decided: August 18, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Armando Despaigne Zulveta, Appellant Pro Se. Phillip E. Reeves,  
GALLIVAN, WHITE & BOYD, PA, Greenville, South Carolina; Eric K.  
Englehardt, TURNER, PADGET, GRAHAM & LANEY, PA, Greenville,  
South Carolina; Timothy Alan Domin, CLAWSON & STAUBES, LLC,  
Charleston, South Carolina; James Ben Alexander, Kenneth Norman  
Shaw, HAYNSWORTH, SINKLER & BOYD, PA, Greenville, South

Carolina; Wilson Scarborough Sheldon, WILLSON JONES CARTER &  
BAXLEY, P.A., Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Armando Despaigne Zúlveta seeks to appeal the district court's orders adopting the magistrate judge's recommendations to grant Defendants' motion to file a late answer, deny Zúlveta's motion for default judgment, and grant motions to dismiss Zúlveta's claims against several Defendants. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The orders Zúlveta seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor 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