

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-6973**

---

CHARLIE L. HARDIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT ROACH; SUPERINTENDENT ALBRIGHT;  
SUPERINTENDENT CROWE; OFFICER ZANANY; SERGEANT GILLIS;  
SERGEANT COOPER; SERGEANT BENNETT; SERGEANT GLENWOOD;  
OFFICER CARTER; OFFICER GATHER; OFFICER DURHAM; OFFICER  
BATES; OFFICER WILSON; OFFICER GARDNER; OFFICER BROWN;  
SUPERINTENDENT H. CON; OFFICER THREAT; CAPTAIN FRINK; NURSE  
JACKSON; NURSE STEVIS or CLEVIS; WARDEN J. KERN-CORRELL;  
ASSOC. WARDEN B. COOPER; UNIT MANAGER WALKER; UNIT  
MANAGER RANES; OFFICER VEAGOS; OFFICER DEKITI; OFFICER  
CANON; OFFICER HOLLEY; OFFICER SMITH; OFFICER DOYE; OFFICER  
HARGROVE; OFFICER WASHINGTON; OFFICER SCOTT-LEE; OFFICER  
BRYAN; OFFICER WORTHY; SERGEANT ARTIS; SERGEANT WEBSTER;  
OFFICER PERRY; DR. GLORIA HARVEY; MR. FRASER; CASE MANAGER  
ALLEN; OFFICER MEDINA; OFFICER MAYFIELD,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at  
Raleigh. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (5:23-ct-03070-D)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2023

Decided: November 28, 2023

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charlie L. Hardin, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charlie L. Hardin seeks to appeal the district court's order and judgment denying his motion for a preliminary injunction and dismissing his civil action. 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)(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 August 8, 2023, and its judgment on August 9, 2023. Hardin filed the notice of appeal on September 12, 2023.\* Because Hardin failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to 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*

---

\* For the purpose of this appeal, we assume that the date appearing on the notice of appeal is the earliest date Hardin could have delivered the notice to prison officials for mailing to the court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1); *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).