

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6024

JONAH JERVAIS SOVEREIGN, a/k/a Jarvis L. Canslor,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LESLIE FLEMING; J.J. SHORT; R. SAYLOR; J.B. CRABTREE; C/O A. CRAFT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 17-7004

JONAH JERVAIS SOVEREIGN, a/k/a Jarvis L. Canslor,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

R. SAYLOR,

Defendant – Appellee,

and

LESLIE FLEMING; J. J. SHORT; J. CRABTREE; C/O A. CRAFT,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior District Judge. (7:15-cv-00568-JLK-RSB)

Submitted: September 28, 2017

Decided: October 2, 2017

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jonah Jervais Sovereign, Appellant Pro Se. Margaret Hoehl O'Shea, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jonah Jervais Sovereign seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his civil rights complaint and declining to extend the appeal period. We dismiss the appeals for lack of jurisdiction because the notices of appeal were 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 dismissing the complaint was entered on the docket on September 2, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed on October 16, 2016.* The court's order denying an extension of the appeal period was entered June 9, 2017. Sovereign's notice of appeal from that order was filed July 31, 2017. Because Sovereign failed to file a timely notice of appeal in either case or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeals. 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

* For the purpose of these appeals, we assume that the date appearing on the notices of appeal is the earliest date the notices 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).