UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1394

GREGORY PERRY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL PARIS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; CORRECT CARE SOLUTIONS, LLC, and unknown officers, agents and employees of the ROGERS; TARASOVA; CHARLES; MCCORMICK; RIVERSIDE REGIONAL JAIL AUTHORITY, and unknown officers, agents, employees; JEFFERY L. NEWTON, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; W. M. MINTON, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; REYNOLDS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; UPSHAW, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; CRYSTAL H. REID, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; GIVENS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; REEDY, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; LANGLEY, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; COLEMAN, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; MELISSA L. LEWIS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; BEACH, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; SMITH, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; PEET, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; J. DAVID RIEGLER, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; JAMES P. NANKERVIS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; BRIAN P. ROBERTS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; KYLE WOODS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; THIERRY G. DUPUIS, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; CHARLES J. HOMILLER, JR., Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; DAVID E. JOHNSON, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; SHAWN A. GOBBLE, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the same; WILLIAM W. DAVENPORT, Regional Jail Facility Contractor of the CHESTERFIELD COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT: COUNTY OF CHESTERFIELD, VIRGINIA, and unknown officers, agents and employees of the same; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, unknown officers, agents and employees of the same; MARY E. CRAZE; T. NOEL BROOKS; WENDY S. HUGHES; JEAN HARRISON CLEMENTS; JAMES W. HALEY, JR.; JERE M.H. WILLIS, JR.; MARY E. CLARKE; REED; T. J. HAULER; STEVEN C. Appeal: 18-1394 Doc: 13 Filed: 07/30/2018 Pg: 2 of 3

MCCALLUM; ARMOR CORRECTIONAL HEALTH SERVICES, unknown officers, agents and employees of the same; VINCENT GORE; WILLIS; VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, unknown officers, agents and employees of the same; HAROLD W. CLARKE; EDDIE L. PEARSON; RODNEY W. YOUNCE; D. Y. KINSLEY; L. BURROWS; R. PARKER; K. PHILLIPS; S. TAPP; HENSLEY; VIRGINIA STATE BAR; VIRGINIA JUDICIAL INQUIRY AND REVIEW COMMISSION,

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:17-cv-00586-LO-IDD)

Submitted: July 26, 2018

Decided: July 30, 2018

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gregory Perry, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 18-1394 Doc: 13 Filed: 07/30/2018 Pg: 3 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Gregory Perry seeks to appeal the district court's order denying Perry's motion for reconsideration of the court's order dismissing Perry's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint as frivolous. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded thirty 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 March 6, 2018. The notice of appeal was filed on April 6, 2018. Because Perry 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 materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED