

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1027

MARIELA VALDERRAMA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HONEYWELL TSI AEROSPACE SERVICES; VICTOR MILLER, Counsel;
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL, INCORPORATED; KATHERINE L. ADAMS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, District Judge. (8:09-
cv-02114-RWT)

Submitted: April 21, 2011

Decided: April 27, 2011

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part; affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam
opinion.

Mariela Valderrama, Appellant Pro Se. Howard Shapiro, PROSKAUER
ROSE, LLP, New Orleans, Louisiana, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mariela Valderrama seeks to appeal the district court's order granting summary judgment to Defendants in her civil action alleging violations of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 1001 to 1461 (West 2008 & Supp. 2010), and the Maryland Wage Payment and Collection Law, Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. §§ 3-501 to 3-509 (LexisNexis 2008 & Supp. 2010), and its subsequent order denying her motions for relief from judgment and for a perjury hearing and granting Defendants' motion for leave to file a sur-reply memorandum.

Parties are accorded thirty 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 granting summary judgment to Defendants was entered on the docket on July 14, 2010. However, Valderrama's motion for relief from judgment, which we treat as a Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend

judgment,* stayed the appeal the period. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A). The district court denied the Rule 59(e) motion by order entered on September 15, 2010. Valderrama had thirty days, or until October 15, 2010, to file her notice of appeal. The notice of appeal was not filed until January 7, 2011. Because Valderrama failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal of these orders for lack of jurisdiction.

Valderrama also appeals the district court's order granting in part Defendants' motion for sanctions and denying Valderrama's motion to renew. On appeal, we confine our review to issues raised in the Appellant's informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Valderrama's informal appellate brief alleges no relevant claim of error by the district court. We conclude that Valderrama has forfeited appellate review of this order, see Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc., 562 F.3d 599, 607 (4th Cir. 2009), cert. denied, 130 S. Ct. 1140 (2010), and therefore affirm it. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

* Valderrama's motion for relief from judgment sought reconsideration of the district court's July 14 order granting summary judgment to Defendants and was filed on July 21, 2010, within the twenty-eight-day time limit for filing Rule 59(e) motions. Accordingly, we treat the motion as a Rule 59(e) motion. Dove v. CODESCO, 569 F.2d 807, 809 (4th Cir. 1978).

materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED IN PART;
AFFIRMED IN PART