Appeal: 10-1641 Doc: 11 Filed: 10/01/2010 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1641

GEORGIA L. GILCHRIST,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

MARIKA G. MATTHEWS,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUD HOUSING INSPECTOR; INSPECTOR DOWNING; INSPECTOR MARYLON BOND; ANTHONEY WILLIAM FLETCHER; ERICA DEAN; JACK B. JOHNSON,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, District Judge. (8:09-cv-00469-RWT)

Submitted: September 28, 2010 Decided: October 1, 2010

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Georgia L. Gilchrist, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Georgia Gilchrist seeks to appeal the district court's dismissal of her civil action without prejudice and the denial or her motions to reopen the case. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than sixty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), 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." <u>Bowles v. Russell</u>, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court's dismissal order was entered on the docket on April 20, 2009, and the court denied the motions to reopen on July 22 and November 4, 2009. The notice of appeal was filed on June 7, 2010. Because Gilchrist failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We deny Gilchrist's motions to amend the caption and to appoint counsel and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

Appeal: 10-1641 Doc: 11 Filed: 10/01/2010 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED