

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2004

JOHN S. STRITZINGER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; STATE OF TEXAS; DR. VYAS, Eastern States Hospital; DR. FRANCES TUNNEY, Charleston SC - Doctor; PATRICK D. BLAKE, Wilcox Savage - Norfolk Verizon Outside Counsel; JUDGE HANSEN, 2nd Judicial Circuit of Virginia; JUDGE WOOLARD, 2nd Judicial Circuit of Virginia; JUDGE HODGES, 2nd Judicial Circuit of Virginia; JUDGE HAMMONS, 2nd Judicial Circuit of Virginia Re Bond,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (3:15-cv-00658-TLW)

Submitted: December 15, 2015

Decided: December 17, 2015

Before GREGORY and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John S. Stritzinger, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Stritzinger seeks to appeal the district court's orders adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss his complaint and denying reconsideration. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded 30 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).

The district court's order denying the timely filed motion for reconsideration was entered on the docket on July 9, 2015. See Fed. R. Civ. 59(e); Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A). The notice of appeal was filed on September 1, 2015. Because Stritzinger failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We deny the motion for leave to file electronically and 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