

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2454

MICHAEL SCOTT; TERRY A. SCOTT,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

SAMUEL I. WHITE, P.C.; WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.; DLJ MORTGAGE
CAPITAL, INC.; GE MORTGAGE SERVICES, LLC; WELLS FARGO HOME
MORTGAGE, INC., d/b/a America's Servicing Company; USA BANK,
NA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District
Judge. (2:08-cv-00097-RAJ-JEB)

Submitted: March 6, 2014

Decided: March 13, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Scott and Terry A. Scott, Appellants Pro Se. Stanley
Graves Barr, Jr., Richard Johan Conrad, KAUFMAN & CANOLES, PC,
Norfolk, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Scott and Terry A. Scott seek to appeal the district court's orders dismissing their complaint and denying their motion for relief from judgment. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

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). If a party timely files a motion under Rule 59(e) or Rule 60(b), the time for filing an appeal runs from the district court's disposition of that motion. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A)(iv), (vi). "[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 order dismissing the complaint was entered on the docket on March 14, 2008. The court denied the motion for relief from judgment on June 5, 2009. The notice of appeal was filed on November 25, 2013. Because the Scotts 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