

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 20-1666**

---

SAMUEL DAVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:20-cv-00851-CMC)

---

Submitted: August 25, 2020

Decided: August 27, 2020

---

Before KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Samuel Davis, Appellant Pro Se. Charles J. Boykin, Kenneth A. Davis, Tierney F. Dukes, BOYKIN & DAVIS, LLC, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Samuel Davis seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his personal injury complaint.\* We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

In civil cases, parties have 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). On March 16, 2020, the district court adopted a standing order extending "all deadlines [in civil cases], whether set by court or by the Rules of Civil Procedure . . . by 21 days." *Standing Order Regarding Court Operations in Response to COVID-19*, No. 3:20-mc-00105-RBH (D.S.C. Mar. 16, 2020). "[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 entered its order on March 24, 2020. Davis filed the notice of appeal on June 15, 2020. Even giving Davis the benefit of the standing order, he failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period. We therefore dismiss the appeal.

---

\* Because "the grounds [for] dismissal make clear that no amendment could cure the defects in [Davis'] case," the district court's dismissal is final and appealable. *Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392*, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066 (4th Cir. 1993) (internal quotation marks omitted).

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*