


of the denial of her Motion for Reconsideration. *Id.* The clerk's office's receipt of the Notice of Appeal rendered the Notice of Appeal "filed" for purposes of Rule 4(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, see *Royall v. Nat'l Ass'n of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO*, 548 F.3d 137, 142 (D.C. Cir. 2008) ("The Supreme Court has long recognized that, with exceptions not relevant here, receipt by the clerk within the required time period satisfies the timely filing requirement for a notice of appeal in a civil case[.]" (citing *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 273–74 (1988); *Parissi v. Teechron, Inc.*, 349 U.S. 46, 46 (1955))), even though the Notice was not formally entered on the docket until September 1, 2016, Notice of Appeal, ECF No. 24. Accordingly, Smith's Notice of Appeal was timely filed.

Dated: December 23, 2016



Amit P. Mehta
United States District Judge