

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1491

KEVIN SCHAAP,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KENTUCKY HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENT LOAN CORPORATION;
KENTUCKY HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE AGENCY; EQUIFAX
INFORMATION SERVICES; EXPERIAN INFORMATION SERVICES;
TRANSUNION, LLC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (0:16-cv-02779-CMC-PJG)

Submitted: August 24, 2017

Decided: August 28, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and SHEDD and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin Schaap, Appellant Pro Se. Russell M. Racine, Virginia Marie Wooten, CRANFILL, SUMNER & HARTZOG, LLP, Charlotte, North Carolina; Rita Bolt Barker, WYCHE, P.A., Greenville, South Carolina; Norman Charles Campbell, II, KING & SPALDING, LLP, Atlanta, Georgia; William Henry Rooks, JONES DAY, Atlanta, Georgia; Lyndey Ritz Zwingelberg, ADAMS & REESE, LLP, Columbia, South Carolina; Russell Grainger Hines, Wilbur Eugene Johnson, YOUNG CLEMENT

RIVERS, LLP, Charleston, South Carolina; Amanda P. Loughmiller, STRASBURGER & PRICE, LLP, Frisco, Texas, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Schaap seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's text order denying Schaap's motion for extensions of multiple filing deadlines in his underlying civil action. 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 order Schaap seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we grant Defendants' motions to dismiss and dismiss this appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny Schaap's motions for judicial notice of fraud on the court and for a stay of these proceedings. 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