

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2087

SHANEKA SHARDAY FLOURNOY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SPARTANBURG REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Jacquelyn Denise Austin, Magistrate Judge. (7:12-cv-02792-TMC-JDA)

Submitted: December 17, 2013

Decided: December 19, 2013

Before KING, GREGORY, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shaneka Sharday Flournoy, Appellant Pro Se. William B. Darwin, Jr., HOLCOMBE BOMAR, PA, Spartanburg, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Shaneka Sharday Flournoy seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's order granting Spartanburg Regional Medical Center's motion for extension of the dates in the court's scheduling order. Spartanburg Regional Medical Center has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

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 magistrate judge's order was entered on the docket on July 9, 2013. The notice of appeal was filed on August 30, 2013. Because Flournoy failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we grant Spartanburg Regional Medical Center's motion and dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.* We dispense with oral

* We also lack jurisdiction over this appeal because the order Flournoy seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1291-1292 (2006); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).

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