

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1810**

---

NACOLE HAUSE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ASTRAZENECA, LP,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (6:14-cv-04090-TMC)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2015

Decided: November 19, 2015

---

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nacole Hause, Appellant Pro Se. Charles Edgar McDonald, III, OGLETREE DEAKINS NASH SMOAK & STEWART, PC, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nacole Hause seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and granting AstraZeneca, LP's motion for summary judgment. Hause also appeals the district court's orders denying her motion to seal the record and her motion for reconsideration of that denial.

In civil actions in which the United States is not a party, parties are accorded 30 days after the entry of final judgment to note an appeal. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A). The district court may, however, extend the time for filing a notice of appeal if a party so moves within 30 days after the expiration of the original appeal period and demonstrates excusable neglect or good cause for the extension. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). The district court may also reopen the appeal period under certain conditions. 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).

Hause did not file a notice of appeal within 30 days of the district court's order of judgment and did not seek an extension of the appeal period until after expiration of the excusable-neglect period. Accordingly, this court lacks jurisdiction to consider Hause's appeal of the district court's order granting summary judgment, and we dismiss this portion of the appeal.

Hause did timely appeal the district court's denial of her motion to seal and her motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in those orders. Accordingly, we affirm them for the reasons stated by the district court. Hause v. AstraZeneca, LP, No. 6:14-cv-04090-TMC (D.S.C. July 13, 2015; Sept. 11, 2015). We deny Hause's motion to seal the record on 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 IN PART;  
AFFIRMED IN PART