

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-2312**

---

EARL STEWART GORDON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GREATER WASHINGTON ORTHOPAEDIC GROUP, P.A.; DISTRICT COURT  
OF MARYLAND FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY; THE HEALTH CLAIM  
ARBITRATION OFFICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District  
Judge. (8:14-cv-02429-DKC)

---

Submitted: April 23, 2015

Decided: April 27, 2015

---

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam  
opinion.

---

Earl Stewart Gordon, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Earl Stewart Gordon seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing without prejudice his civil action and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration. We dismiss in part and affirm in part.

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. 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). Because Gordon filed his appeal more than thirty days after the entry of the district court's order dismissing his action without prejudice, and failed to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal of this order as untimely.

Gordon's notice of appeal was timely as to the order denying his Rule 60(b) motion. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's denial of the Rule 60(b) motion for the reasons stated by the district court. Gordon v. Greater Washington Orthopaedic Group, P.A., No. 8:14-cv-02429-DKC (D. Md. Oct. 27, 2014). 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART; DISMISSED IN PART