

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6687

ALBERT CURTIS MILLS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FORMER GOVERNOR LAWRENCE HOGAN; ROBERT GREEN, former Secretary of DPSCS; O. WAYNE HILL, former DPSCS Deputy Secretary for Operations; FRANK B. BISHOP, JR., Division of Correction (“DOC”) Assistant Commissioner (West); F. TODD TAYLOR, JR., Inmate Grievance Office Direction; WARDEN JEFF NINES; SANDRA HOLMES, IGO Administrative Officer III; VAUGHN WHITEMAN, Correctional Officer Lieutenant,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-6688

ALBERT CURTIS MILLS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LAUREN BEITZEL; VAUGHN WHITEMAN; JOHN G. SINDY; MISTY J. GUTHRIE; RICHARD S. RODERICK; LAWRI WINTERS; JAMES WILSON; ANITA ROZAS; FRANK B. BISHOP; JAMIE FARRIS; CHRISTOPHER WEDLOCK; F. TODD TAYLOR; ROBIN WOOLFORD; ROBERT L. GREEN; LAWRENCE J. HOGAN; THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DIVISION OF CORRECTION; NORTH BRANCH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-6689

ALBERT CURTIS MILLS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LAUREN BEITZEL; APRIL CARR; VAUGHN WHITEMAN; JOHN G. SINDY;
MISTY J. GUTHRIE; RICHARD S. RODERICK; L. WINTERS; J. WILSON;
ANITA ROZAS; FRANK B. BISHOP; JAMIE FARRIS; ROBIN WOOLFORD;
NORTH BRANCH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; THE MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF CORRECTION; INMATE GRIEVANCE OFFICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-6690

ALBERT CURTIS MILLS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NORTH BRANCH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; APRIL CARR; LAUREN
BEITZEL; VAUGHN WHITEMAN; JOHN G. SINDY; MISTY J. GUTHRIE;
RICHARD S. RODERICK; LAWRI WINTERS; JAMES WILSON; JEFF NINES;
ANITA ROZAS; FRANK B. BISHOP; ROBIN WOOLFORD,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Lydia Kay Griggsby, District Judge. (1:22-cv-01512-LKG; 1:22-cv-02805-LKG; 1:23-cv-
01027-LKG; 1:23-cv-00382-LKG)

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 26, 2026

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Albert Curtis Mills, Appellant Pro Se. Robert D. Goodis, Assistant Attorney General,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Albert Curtis Mills seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendants' motions to dismiss or, alternatively, for summary judgment, and dismissing Mills' civil complaints. Mills, a Maryland inmate, filed four complaints in the district court, each regarding his housing assignment and mental health treatment. The district court consolidated the complaints and, finding that Mills failed to state a claim, it dismissed them in a single order. We dismiss these consolidated appeals for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

In civil cases, parties have 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 entered its order on January 17, 2024, and the appeal period expired on February 16, 2024. Mills filed the notice of appeal on July 30, 2025.* Because Mills failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the consolidated appeals.

* For the purpose of these appeals, we assume that the date Mills signed the notice of appeal is the earliest date Mills could have delivered the notice to prison officials for mailing to the court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1); *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).

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