

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1178

MARY E. HILL; RICHARD L. TOWNSEND, JR.; HORACE CHAPMAN;
MARIE HILL; MAXIE BRINKLEY; PERRY KING,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CITY OF SUFFOLK,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, Senior District Judge. (2:10-cv-00430-JBF-DEM)

Submitted: September 29, 2011 Decided: November 16, 2011

Before KING, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mary E. Hill; Richard L. Townsend, Jr.; Horace Chapman; Marie Hill; Maxie Brinkley; Perry King, Appellants Pro Se. John Anthony Conrad, CONRAD FIRM, Richmond, Virginia; William Edward Hutchings, Jr., OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY, Suffolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mary E. Hill and related parties appeal the district court's order denying their motion for an extension of time to file their appeal, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), filed in their underlying 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action. We have reviewed the record and conclude the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion. See Thompson v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Inc., 76 F.3d 530, 532 (4th Cir. 1996) (stating an abuse of discretion review standard when a district court grants a motion for an enlargement of time to file an appeal); United States v. Borrromeo, 945 F.2d 750, 754 (4th Cir. 1991) (providing an abuse of discretion review standard for denial of a motion for enlargement of time). Accordingly, we deny Appellants' pending motion for injunctive relief and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Hill v. City of Suffolk, No. 2:10-cv-00430-JBF-DEM (E.D. Va. Jan. 21, 2011). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED