

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-1625**

---

MOHAMMAD ASLAM MIAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LOANCARE SERVICING COMPANY; NEWREZ LOAN CARE; FANNIE MAE,  
Loan Guarantor,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.  
Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:21-cv-02419-DKC)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2023

Decided: November 27, 2023

---

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

---

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mohammad Aslam Mian, Appellant Pro Se. Jason E. Manning, TROUTMAN PEPPER  
HAMILTON SANDERS LLP, Virginia Beach, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mohammad Aslam Mian seeks to appeal the district court's orders granting Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings and denying Mian's several postjudgment motions. 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). While the filing of certain motions may toll the running of the appeal period, Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(a)(4)(A), "[s]uccessive post-judgment motions do not allow an effective extension of time to appeal from the denial of the initial [postjudgment] motion, let alone the original judgment," *Armstrong v. Loudon*, 834 F.3d 767, 769 (7th Cir. 2016); *see EEOC v. Central Motor Lines, Inc.*, 537 F.2d 1162, 1165 (4th Cir. 1976).

Mian's notice of appeal, filed on May 30, 2023, is timely only as to the district court's May 25, 2023, order denying his motion for a more definite statement and for a final order. Regarding that order, we have reviewed the record and found no reversible error. As for the other orders Mian seeks to appeal, each order was entered more than 30 days prior to Mian's May 30, 2023, notice of appeal, and Mian did not obtain an extension or reopening of any appeal period. Thus, we lack jurisdiction to review any other orders.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's May 25, 2023, order, and we dismiss the balance of this appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny Mian's motion to seal and 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*