

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6699

ONAJE KUDURA SEABROOK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LT. CARTER; SGT. MILES PERKINS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JANE DOE #3, Health Care Authority; JANE DOE #2, Nurse; JANE DOE #1,
Nurse; JANE DOE #4, Nurse,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken.
Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (1:23-cv-00007-RMG)

Submitted: December 18, 2025

Decided: December 23, 2025

Before NIEMEYER and BERNER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Onaje Kudura Seabrook, Appellant Pro Se. Charles Clifford Rollins, RICHARDSON
PLOWDEN & ROBINSON, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Onaje Kudura Seabrook seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and granting summary judgment in favor of the defendants in Seabrook's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. We dismiss the appeal 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). "The timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement." *Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007) (citation modified).

The district court entered its amended judgment on July 8, 2025, and the appeal period expired on August 7, 2025. Seabrook filed the notice of appeal on August 14, 2025.* He failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period. Accordingly, we deny Seabrook's pending motion to appoint counsel, and 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

* Seabrook certified that he delivered the notice to prison officials for mailing to the court on August 14. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1); *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).