

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2048

MICHAEL PETROS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PAUL BOOS; CITY OF WHEELING, WEST VIRGINIA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Wheeling. Frederick P. Stamp, Jr., Senior District Judge. (5:10-cv-00077-FPS)

Submitted: March 3, 2017

Decided: March 21, 2017

Before TRAXLER, KING, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Petros, Appellant Pro Se. Rosemary Jennifer Humway-Warmuth, CITY SOLICITOR'S OFFICE, Wheeling, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Petros seeks to appeal two district court orders applying a prefiling injunction and preventing him from filing two new complaints. Petros filed notices of appeal following the entry of each order. We affirm in part and dismiss in part.

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 first district court order was entered on the docket on August 8, 2016. The notice of appeal challenging the August 8 order was filed 36 days later, on September 13, 2016. Because Petros failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss this portion of the appeal.

As to the second notice of appeal, which is timely as to the district court's November 16, 2016, order, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Petros' informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, he has forfeited appellate review of this order. See Williams v. Giant

Food Inc., 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, we affirm as to this order.

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