UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2009

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR., on behalf of and as next friend of J.F.D., a minor,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

J.F.D., a minor,

Plaintiff,

v.

MELANIE A. SHEKITA, Individually and as a Wake County NC Assistant District Attorney for the State of North Carolina; MICHELLE SAVAGE, individually and as a Police Detective for the Cary North Carolina Police Department; DANIELLE DOYLE, individually and as a Wake County North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services Child Protective Services Social Worker; ERIC CRAIG CHASSE, individually and as a Wake County North Carolina Family Court Judge; MIKE EASLEY, individually and as Governor of the State of North Carolina; BEVERLY PERDUE, individually and as Governor of the State of North Carolina,

Defendants - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard, Senior District Judge. (5:12-cv-00504-H)

Submitted: November 22, 2016 Decided: November 29, 2016

Before DIAZ and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Scott Davis, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Scott Davis, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying six motions in a closed 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action. 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 was entered on the docket on April 5, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed on August 30, 2016.* Because Davis 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 all pending motions, including Davis' motions to consolidate, to appoint counsel, and to remand the case. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

3

^{*} For the purpose of this appeal, we assume that the date appearing on the notice of appeal is the earliest date it could have been properly delivered to prison officials for mailing to the court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c); <u>Houston v. Lack</u>, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED