

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1777

ROCHELL TALLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC; BWW LAW GROUP, LLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Timothy J. Sullivan, Magistrate Judge. (8:18-cv-00052-TJS)

Submitted: November 29, 2018

Decided: December 3, 2018

Before AGEE, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rochell Talley, Appellant Pro Se. Eric Matthew Hurwitz, William T. Mandia, STRADLEY RONON STEVENS & YOUNG, LLP, Cherry Hill, New Jersey; Adam Marc Kaplan, BWW LAW GROUP, LLC, Rockville, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rochell Talley seeks to appeal the district court's order of June 6, 2018 dismissing his civil action and its order of July 2, 2018 denying his motion for an extension of time to file a motion to reconsider. We grant appellee's motion to dismiss the appeal of the June 6, 2018 order for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

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. 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 June 6, 2018. The notice of appeal was filed on July 9, 2018. Because Talley failed to file a timely notice of appeal or obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal in part with respect to that order. As to the order of July 2, 2018, we affirm in part for the reasons stated by the district court. *Talley v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC*, No. 8:18-cv-00052-TJS (D. Md. July 2, 2018). 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 IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*