

special-master review of those records. App. A at 18-19. Applicant does not acknowledge, much less attempt to rebut, the court's careful analysis of those issues.

Instead, applicant principally asserts (Appl. 9-29) that although the court of appeals had jurisdiction to stay the district court's injunction, it lacked jurisdiction to stay the special master's review. That is wrong for three independent reasons. First, the court of appeals correctly held that it had pendent jurisdiction to address the special master's review because the injunction -- which precluded the government's use of the documents "pending resolution of the special master's review," App. B at 23 -- is "inextricably intertwined" with that review, App. A at 15 n.3 (citation omitted). Second, 28 U.S.C. 1292(a)(1) grants appellate jurisdiction to review "[i]nterlocutory orders of the district courts * * * granting, continuing, modifying, refusing or dissolving injunctions" (emphasis added). Appellate jurisdiction thus lies over the entire order granting an injunction, as this Court has held in interpreting other statutes granting jurisdiction to review particular types of "orders." See, e.g., BP p.l.c. v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1537-1538 (2021). Here, the district court's September 5 order not only granted an injunction, but also provided that a "special master shall be APPOINTED to review the seized property," including the records bearing classification markings. App. B at 23. Third, a