## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1681

HILDA LEAH FLOYD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, Transportation Security Administration (UC Express); TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMIN AGENCY, (US Express),

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (1:09-cv-00735-RDB)

Submitted: October 21, 2014 Decided: October 23, 2014

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hilda Leah Floyd, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph Ronald Baldwin, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Hilda Leah Floyd seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying her motions to reopen her civil case and to answer new information. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than sixty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), 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." <u>Bowles v. Russell</u>, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court's orders were entered on the docket on March 4, 2014. The notice of appeal was filed on July 2, 2014.\* Because Floyd failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. Floyd's motion to seal her informal brief is granted. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

 $<sup>^{\</sup>ast}$  Floyd filed her notice of appeal in this Court on July 2, 2014, and it was thereafter forwarded to the district court.  $\underline{\text{See}}$  Fed. R. App. P. 4(d).

Appeal: 14-1681 Doc: 9 Filed: 10/23/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED