

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-2053

JONATHAN HARRIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

JERAMIE BARIDEAUX,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF CHARLOTTE; RODNEY MONROE, Chief; JOHN C. GORROD,
Sergeant; MICHAEL R. BODENSTEIN, Officer; MICHAEL C. WALLIN,
Officer,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina,
at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Senior District Judge. (3:16-cv-00146-GCM)

Submitted: December 19, 2017

Decided: December 21, 2017

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jonathan Harris, Appellant Pro Se. Daniel Edward Peterson, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Charlotte, North Carolina; Ronald L. Gibson, RUFF BOND COBB WADE & BETHUNE, LLP, Charlotte, North Carolina; Jason Robert Benton, PARKER, POE, ADAMS & BERNSTEIN, LLP, Charlotte, North Carolina; Lori R. Keeton, LAW OFFICES OF LORI KEETON, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jonathan Harris seeks to appeal the district court's orders granting summary judgment in favor of the defendants and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) claims and related state law claims. 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 August 8, 2017. The notice of appeal was filed on September 8, 2017. Because Harris failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal. 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 the decisional process.

DISMISSED