## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

## No. 13-1440

TROY WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TERO TEK INTERNATIONAL, INC.; TERO TEK INTERNATIONAL, INC., Corporate Headquarters,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. James K. Bredar, District Judge. (1:10-cv-02752-JKB)

Submitted: June 20, 2013

Before GREGORY, DUNCAN, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part, and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Troy Williams, Appellant Pro Se. James A. Rothschild, ANDERSON, COE & KING, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Dockets.Justia.com

Decided: June 25, 2013

PER CURIAM:

Troy Williams appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to the defendant and its subsequent order denying his motion to reopen.<sup>\*</sup> We dismiss the appeal of the order granting summary judgment for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal from that order was not timely filed. We affirm the denial of Williams' motion to reopen.

Parties are accorded thirty 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's summary judgment order was entered on the docket on February 27, 2012. The notice of appeal was filed on April 1, 2013. Because Williams failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period we dismiss the appeal to the

2

<sup>\*</sup> Williams' informal brief states that he also appeals the district court's marginal order entered April 3, 2013, denying his motion for reconsideration. Williams did not file a notice of appeal of this order and it is therefore not properly before this court.

extent it challenges the district court's summary judgment order.

Although Williams timely appealed the denial of his motion to reopen, we find no abuse of discretion. <u>MLC Auto.,</u> <u>LLC v. Town of S. Pines</u>, 532 F.3d 269, 277 (4th Cir. 2008). Accordingly, we affirm. 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 IN PART; AFFIRMED IN PART