

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-1535**

---

SIDDHANTH SHARMA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DAMON CIRCOSTA, in his official capacity as Chair of the North Carolina State Board of Elections; STELLA ANDERSON, in her official capacity as a member of the North Carolina State Board of Elections; JEFF CARMON, in his official capacity as a member of the North Carolina State Board of Elections; STACY EGGERS, IV, in his official capacity as a member of the North Carolina State Board of Elections; TOMMY TUCKER, in his official capacity as a member of the North Carolina State Board of Elections; KAREN BRINSON BELL, in her official capacity as the Executive Director of the North Carolina State Board of Elections; NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:22-cv-00059-BO)

---

Submitted: February 22, 2024

Decided: February 26, 2024

---

Before NIEMEYER and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Siddhanth Sharma, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Siddhanth Sharma seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his complaint and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion. We dismiss in part and affirm in part.

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)(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 dismissal order on May 16, 2022. Sharma filed the notice of appeal on May 15, 2023. Because Sharma failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period,<sup>\*</sup> we dismiss the appeal as to the dismissal order.

Turning to the district court's denial of Sharma's Rule 60(b) motion, from which Sharma timely appealed, we have reviewed the record and discern no reversible error. Therefore, we affirm the district court's order. *Sharma v. Circosta*, No. 5:22-cv-00059-BO (E.D.N.C. filed May 11, 2023 & entered May 12, 2023). We deny Sharma's motions for injunctive relief and to consolidate. We dispense with oral argument because the facts

---

<sup>\*</sup> Sharma's Rule 60(b) motion did not toll the appeal period because it was not filed within 28 days of the entry of the underlying dismissal order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4).

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*