UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1477

JEWEL D. HILL,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

NISSA N. MUWWAKKIL,

Defendant – Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:10-cv-00915-HEH)

Submitted: September 29, 2011 Decided: October 4, 2011

Before KING, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part, affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jewel D. Hill, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jewel D. Hill seeks to appeal the district court's orders (1) dismissing her civil action for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; (2) denying her motion for extension of time to file a notice of appeal; and (3) denying her motion for reconsideration. We dismiss the appeal in part and affirm in part.

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 dismissing Hill's action was entered on the docket on February 1, 2011. Over thirty days later, on March 23, 2011, Hill filed both a motion for extension of time to file a notice of appeal and a notice of appeal. The district court denied Hill's motion for extension of time because she failed to demonstrate excusable neglect or good cause. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5)(A)(i). Because Hill failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal in part.

Moreover, because we agree that Hill failed to demonstrate excusable neglect or good cause, we affirm the district court's order denying her motion for extension of time. Finally, we affirm the district court's order denying Hill's motion for reconsideration.

We deny Hill's motions to certify questions to the United States Attorney General and the Virginia Attorney General. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART