

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2011

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ATTORNEY RICHARD DURHAM,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard, Senior District Judge. (5:11-cv-00036-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Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 text order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion 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 May 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 and to appoint a guardian ad litem. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and

* 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); Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED