

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1783

RONNIE CLARKE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PETERSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:14-cv-00239-REP)

Submitted: November 20, 2014

Decided: November 24, 2014

Before KING and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronnie Clarke, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronnie Clarke seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Clarke filed the motion along with a complaint alleging that Defendant Petersburg City Public Schools discriminated and retaliated against him in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012). Clarke has also moved to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. We deny Clarke's application to proceed in forma pauperis and 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). "[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). Furthermore, "[a] bare notice of appeal should not be construed as a motion for extension of time, where no request for additional time is manifest." Shah v. Hutto, 722 F.2d 1167, 1168-69 (4th Cir. 1983) (en banc).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on July 1, 2014. The notice of appeal was filed on August 5,

2014. Clarke failed to file a timely notice of appeal or obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period. Accordingly, we deny Clarke's application to proceed in forma pauperis and 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