

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-2127

BRIAN M. BISHOP,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

7-ELEVEN, INC.; JAMES URBAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 11-2129

BRIAN M. BISHOP,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JAMES URBAN; 7-ELEVEN INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Raymond A. Jackson,
District Judge. (4:11-cv-00073-RAJ-FBS; 4:11-cv-00133-RAJ-FBS)

Submitted: January 10, 2012

Decided: February 7, 2012

Before KING, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Brian M. Bishop, Appellant Pro Se. Eric Anthony Welter, WELTER
LAW FIRM, PC, Herndon, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Brian M. Bishop seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his complaint and the district court's order to show cause. We dismiss the appeals for a lack of jurisdiction.

In Appeal No. 11-2127, we dismiss because the notice of appeal was not timely filed. 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 was entered on the docket on August 9, 2011. The notice of appeal was filed on October 14, 2011. Because Bishop failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal.

In Appeal No. 11-2129, we again dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders. 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The order Bishop seeks to appeal is neither a final

order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

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