

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1796

KATHERINE B. ROBINSON; DANA B. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CHESAPEAKE BANK OF MARYLAND; PROCTOR FINANCIAL, INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:16-cv-04119-CCB)

Submitted: November 21, 2017

Decided: November 27, 2017

Before WYNN and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Katherine B. Robinson, Dana B. Williams, Appellants Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Appellants seek to appeal the district court's February 2017 order dismissing without prejudice their civil complaint against Defendants after Appellants failed to comply with the district court's previous order directing that the complaint be supplemented. However, Appellants previously appealed the district court's dismissal order to this court, and we dismissed that appeal. *See Robinson v. Chesapeake Bank of Md.*, 691 F. App'x 782 (4th Cir. 2017) (No. 17-1217). Because we have previously dismissed an appeal of this order, and since Appellants' notice of appeal was filed beyond the 30-day appeal period, *see* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A) (providing that in civil cases in which the United States is a not party, parties are accorded 30 days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to note an appeal), we dismiss this appeal as duplicative and untimely.* 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 in the decisional process.

DISMISSED

* To the extent that the notice of appeal could be construed as attempting to challenge the district court's February 21, 2017, return pleading order, the notice of appeal is untimely as to this order as well.