

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-2055**

---

PAMELA MELVIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

USA TODAY; THE WASHINGTON POST; THE BOSTON GLOBE; CHICAGO  
SUN-TIMES; DETROIT FREE PRESS; LOS ANGELES TIMES; THE  
PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER; TAMPA BAY TIMES; THE DALLAS MORNING  
NEWS; THE ATLANTA JOURNAL-CONSTITUTION; THE STAR-LEDGER,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, Senior  
District Judge. (3:14-cv-00439-JRS)

---

Submitted: January 14, 2016 Decided: January 19, 2016

---

Before AGEE, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed in part, and affirmed in part by unpublished per  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

---

Pamela Melvin, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen M. Faraci, Sr.,  
LECLAIR RYAN, PC, Richmond, Virginia; Leslie Paul Machado,  
Laurin Howard Mills, LECLAIR RYAN, PC, Alexandria, Virginia;  
Bradfute W. Davenport, Jr., TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP, Richmond,  
Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pamela Melvin appeals the district court's order of January 20, 2015, dismissing her complaint and a subsequent order denying her motions to clarify the court's previous order and for relief from judgment. We dismiss in part and affirm in part.

Melvin's appeal of the district court's January 20 order is untimely. 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). The district court's order dismissing Melvin's complaint was entered on the docket on January 20, 2015. The notice of appeal was filed on September 8, 2015. Because Melvin failed to file a timely notice of appeal from the January 20, 2015 order, we do not have jurisdiction to review that order. Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of the appeal.

As to Melvin's appeal of the court's subsequent order denying her motions to clarify and for relief from judgment, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district

court. Melvin v. USA Today, No. 3:14-cv-00439-JRS (E.D. Va. July 28, 2015). 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