

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-6265

ALBERT MARQUAVIOUS LAMAR ANDERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ERIC DYE, Warden, Alexander CI; FNU LNU, Medical Provider, Alexander CI; JEFFREY DUNCAN, Warden, Alexander CI; ALEXANDER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTE; FNU COX, Nurse, Alexander CI; FNU BYRD, Sergeant, Alexander CI; FNU WILKINSON, Officer, Alexander CI; FNU JONATHAN, Lieutenant, Alexander CI; FNU DULLAH, Officer, Alexander CI; FNU REIN, Nurse, Alexander CI; FNU GONZALEZ, Nurse, Alexander CI; FNU SHOEMAKER, Nurse, Alexander CI; APRIL PARKER, Unit Manager, Alexander CI; FNU COOK, Officer, Alexander CI; FNU LNU, Physical Therapy Nurse, Alexander CI; JOHN/JANE DOE, 1-16,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Martin K. Reidinger, Chief District Judge. (5:21-cv-00168-MR)

Submitted: December 19, 2023

Decided: December 27, 2023

Before HARRIS, QUATTLEBAUM, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Albert Anderson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Albert Marquavious Lamar Anderson seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. 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 April 25, 2022. Anderson filed the notice of appeal on March 13, 2023.* Because Anderson failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We deny Anderson's motions for general relief.

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 Anderson could have delivered the notice to prison officials for mailing to the court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1); *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).