

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-2233

HOANG TAING,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PENNY PRITZKER, Honorable; Secretary of Commerce; KATHRYN H. ANDERSON, Honorable; Office of Civil Rights, CENHQ 3H068; WILLIAM W. HATCHER, Honorable; U.S. Census Bureau/RCC; DANA JAMES BOENTE, Honorable; US Acting Attorney; LORETTA E. LYNCH, Honorable; Attorney General,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T.S. Ellis, III, Senior District Judge. (1:13-cv-01281-TSE-TCB)

Submitted: June 25, 2015

Decided: June 29, 2015

Before GREGORY, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hoang Taing, Appellant Pro Se. Antonia Marie Konkoly, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Hoang Taing appeals the district court's orders granting summary judgment to Appellees and denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration in this employment discrimination action. We affirm in part and dismiss in part.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than 60 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). The district court's order granting summary judgment to Appellees was entered on the docket on July 7, 2014. The notice of appeal was filed on November 10, 2014. Because Hoang Taing failed to file a timely notice of appeal from the order granting summary judgment or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss this portion of the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Turning to the order denying reconsideration, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the denial of Rule 60(b) relief for the reasons stated by the district court. Hoang Taing v. Pritzker, No. 1:13-cv-01231-TSE-TCB (E.D. Va. filed Nov. 5, 2014; entered Nov. 6, 2014). 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART