UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1630

STANLEY ABLER,

        Plaintiff - Appellant,

    v.

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE,

        Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Beth P. Gesner, Magistrate Judge. (1:18-cv-03668-BPG)

Submitted: August 24, 2023   Decided: August 28, 2023

Before QUATTLEBAUM and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stanley Abler, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stanley Abler seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendant summary judgment on Abler's discrimination claims, which were brought pursuant to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 701 to 796*l*. 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). "[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 18, 2022, and subsequently granted Abler two extensions of the appeal period, the last deadline being June 2, 2022. Abler did not file the notice of appeal, though, until June 6, 2022. Because Abler failed to file a timely notice of appeal—despite receiving two extensions to the filing deadline—and likewise did not seek to reopen the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We deny Abler's motions on ethics issues the district court did not address, for a hearing, and to appoint counsel.

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