

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2074

MICHAEL OSEI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ("UMUC"); THE OFFICE
OF FINANCIAL AID, UMUC; JAVIER MIYARES; JULIE LINDENMEIER;
CLAIRBOURNE W. PATTY; TERRENCE COOPER; LYNETTE O'LEARY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District
Judge. (8:15-cv-02502-DKC)

Submitted: February 16, 2017

Decided: March 3, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, DUNCAN, Circuit Judge, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

Remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Osei, Appellant Pro Se. Christopher Bowie Lord, OFFICE OF
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Osei seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint against the University of Maryland University College and certain employees of the university. 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). However, the district court may extend the time to file a notice of appeal if a party moves for an extension of the appeal period within 30 days after the expiration of the original appeal period and demonstrates excusable neglect or good cause to warrant an extension. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5); Washington v. Bumgarner, 882 F.2d 899, 900-01 (4th Cir. 1989). "[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 entered its order on August 15, 2016. On September 15, 2016, Osei simultaneously filed a motion for reconsideration and a notice of appeal. Although the notice of appeal was one day late, we construe Osei's motion for reconsideration as a motion for an extension of the appeal period.

Accordingly, we remand this case to the district court for the limited purpose of determining whether Osei has demonstrated excusable neglect or good cause warranting an extension of the 30-

day appeal period. The record, as supplemented, will then be returned to this court for further consideration.

REMANDED