

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-7305**

---

UMADINE HATCH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DR. WILSON, NC Correctional Institution for Women; KENNETH PRICE, M.D.;  
UNC HOSPITALS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

DR. BUCKMIRE, Ear, Nose & Throat - UNC Medical Center,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at  
Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, Chief District Judge. (5:17-ct-03030-BO)

---

Submitted: December 20, 2018

Decided: December 27, 2018

---

Before DIAZ and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Umadine Hatch, Appellant Pro Se. Elizabeth Pharr McCullough, Madeleine Michelle  
Pfefferle, YOUNG MOORE & HENDERSON, PA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for

Appellee Stephen M. Wilson.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Umadine Hatch seeks to appeal the district court's order granting summary judgment and dismissing, for failure to exhaust administrative remedies, Hatch's claims of deliberate indifference to her medical needs when she was a North Carolina prisoner. 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 September 12, 2018. The notice of appeal was filed on October 18, 2018.\* Because Hatch 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*

---

\* For the purpose of this appeal, we assume that the date appearing on the notice of appeal is the earliest date it 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).