

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1729

JOHN RODGERS BURNLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COLONEL BRYAN T. NORWOOD, Chief of Police for the City of Richmond; JOHN VENUTI, Chief of Police - Virginia Commonwealth University; HOWARD J. HICKS, Captain; WILLIAM C. MEADOWS, Lieutenant; AMIRA SLEEM, #3076 Police Officer; BENJAMIN TODERICO, #2614 Police Officer; UNKNOWN NAMED POLICE OFFICERS FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND; JOAN E. JONES; WILLIAM P. WILSON; JEAN J. WILSON; HAZEL MILES; TYRONE M. MILLER; MICHAEL G. MILLER; WALTER EDWARD BAKER; CITY OF RICHMOND, MUNICIPALITY; CITY OF RICHMOND POLICE DEPARTMENT; ANDREW CARR,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:10-cv-00264-HEH)

Submitted: November 17, 2011

Decided: November 22, 2011

Before KING, DAVIS, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Rodgers Burnley, Appellant Pro Se. M. Janet Palmer, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Richmond, Virginia; Milligan Grinstead Goldsmith, Jeffrey Dean McMahan, Jr., William N. Federspiel,

Robert Michael Tyler, MCGUIREWOODS, LLP, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Rodgers Burnley seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal 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 August 4, 2010. The notice of appeal was filed on July 11, 2011. Because Burnley 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 Burnley's motion to strike. 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.

DISMISSED