

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 19-7307**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JERMAIN SANTELL HILL,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 19-7323**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JERMAIN SANTELL HILL,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia,  
at Charleston. John T. Copenhaver, Jr., Senior District Judge. (2:15-cr-00026-1; 2:16-cr-  
00210-1; 2:18-cv-00075)

---

Submitted: November 19, 2019

Decided: November 22, 2019

---

Before WILKINSON and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jermain Santell Hill, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jermain Santell Hill seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Hill's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). We dismiss the appeals for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than 60 days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), 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 July 1, 2019. Hill filed the notice of appeal on September 9, 2019. Because Hill failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeals. Accordingly, we also deny a certificate of appealability. 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*