

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-2298

PEPI SCHAFLER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HSBC BANK USA, Martin J. Glynn, CEO; SCOTT D. MILLER;
PHILLIPS LYTLE; DAVID J. MACNAMARA, Managing Partner;
MICHAEL B. POWERS, Phillips Lytle; M & T BANK, Robert E.
Sadler, Jr., CEO; JAMES H. FRENCH, French & Lyon,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District
Judge. (8:09-cv-01758-AW)

Submitted: June 1, 2010

Decided: June 4, 2010

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam
opinion.

Pepi Schafler, Appellant Pro Se. Sean Charles McPhee, PHILLIPS
LYTLE LLP, Buffalo, New York; Alexander Craig Vincent, SHULMAN,
ROGERS, GANDAL, PORDY & ECKER, PA, Potomac, Maryland; Heather R.
Beygo, Kimberly Lynn Limbrick, CROSSWHITE LIMBRICK & SINCLAIR,
LLP, Baltimore, Maryland; Kevin Miles Kearney, HODGSON RUSS,
LLP, Buffalo, New York, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pepi Schafler appeals the district court's order dismissing her complaint. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Schafler's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, Schafler has forfeited appellate review of the court's order.

Schafler also seeks to appeal the district court's order imposing a pre-filing injunction and awarding Defendants attorneys' fees.* We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal for that order was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded thirty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to note an appeal, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). "[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement." Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on November 9, 2009. The notice of appeal was filed on December

* The amount of attorneys' fees to be awarded has yet to be determined by the district court.

16, 2009. Because Schafler failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal as to this order. 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART