

UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 17-1131

In re: BRUCE W. KOENIG,

Appellant,

CHRISTOPHER JARBOE, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated; CARROLL CONNELLY, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated; VANDER DAVIS, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated; GARY DENMARK, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated; GARFIELD REDD, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

and

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (DPSCS); MARYLAND DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS; MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION, DIVISION OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AND ADULT LEARNING (CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION); MARYLAND CORRECTIONAL ENTERPRISES; MARYLAND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, JESSUP (MCIJ); WESTERN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION (WCI); GARY D. MAYNARD, Secretary, Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services; J. MICHAEL STOUFFER, Maryland Commissioner of Corrections; PAULETTE FRANCOIS, Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation Division of Workforce Development and Adult Learning; STEPHEN M. SHILOH, Chief Executive Officer Maryland Correctional Enterprises; DAYENA CORCORAN, Warden Maryland Correctional Institution, Jessup; J. PHILIP MORGAN, Warden Western Correctional Institution,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Ellen L. Hollander, District Judge. (1:12-cv-00572-ELH)

Submitted: July 20, 2017

Decided: July 24, 2017

Before DUNCAN and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bruce Wayne Koenig, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bruce W. Koenig seeks to appeal the district court's order returning his motion to reopen a prior proceeding in which he was not a party. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded 30 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 16, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed, at the earliest, on January 24, 2017. Because Koenig failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. 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