

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1677

UNDER SEAL 1; UNDER SEAL 2,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

UNDER SEAL 3; UNDER SEAL 4; UNDER SEAL 5; UNDER SEAL 6;
UNDER SEAL 7; UNDER SEAL 8; UNDER SEAL 9; UNDER SEAL 10;
UNDER SEAL 11,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge.
(1:13-cv-00153-RDB)

Submitted: November 22, 2013

Decided: December 5, 2013

Before SHEDD, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Under Seal 1 and Under Seal 2, Appellants Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Under Seal 1 and Under Seal 2 seek to appeal the district court's order dismissing their civil action. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction 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 February 13, 2013. The notice of appeal was filed, at the earliest, on April 17, 2013. Because Appellants failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. 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