Doc. 406415491

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2147

PHILLIP WARD; DEIRDRE WARD,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

BRANCH BANKING AND TRUST; THE FISHER LAW GROUP, PLLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Ellen L. Hollander, District Judge. (8:13-cv-01968-ELH)

Submitted: February 23, 2017 Decided: February 27, 2017

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Phillip Ward, Deirdre Ward, Appellants Pro Se. Brian L. Moffet, Zachary Saul Schultz, MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, PC, Baltimore, Maryland, Martin Stuart Goldberg, BP FISHER LAW GROUP, LLP, Oxon Hill, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Phillip Ward and Deirdre Ward seek to appeal the district court's order denying relief on their civil complaint. Appellee Branch Banking and Trust ("BB&T") moves to dismiss the appeal as untimely, and the Wards have replied to the motion. We grant BB&T's motion and dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

"[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). Generally, a party has 30 days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to notice an appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A). The notice period may be extended or reopened by the district court. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), (6). The district court entered final judgment on May 18, 2016. Because the Wards filed their notice of appeal of this order on July 18, 2016, their notice of appeal was untimely. Additionally, the district court denied their motion to extend the appeal period, finding that the Wards did not demonstrate excusable neglect or good cause for an extension.

Because the Wards failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the Appeal: 16-2147 Doc: 26 Filed: 02/27/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED