## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

## No. 21-2019

## WILLIAM A. TACCINO; CAROL J. TACCINO,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

ACT 1ST FEDERAL CREDIT UNION,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. James K. Bredar, Chief District Judge. (1:21-cv-00840-JKB)

Submitted: June 29, 2022

Decided: July 7, 2022

Before MOTZ and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William A. Taccino, Carol J. Taccino, Appellants Pro Se. Kristin Anne Zech, BERENZWEIG LEONARD, LLP, McLean, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William and Carol Taccino seek to appeal the district court's order dismissing their civil complaint as to their federal claims and remanding their state law claims to state court. 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)(5) or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) or reopens the appeal period under fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) or reopens the appeal period under fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) or reopens the appeal period under fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). "[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 August 12, 2021. The Taccinos filed their notice of appeal on September 14, 2021. Because the Taccinos failed to file a timely notice of appeal or obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, 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

2