

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-2300**

---

ALPHONSO DUNBAR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MARTIN O'MALLEY; JOHN KUO; ARTHUR HOLMES, JR.; PETER V.R.  
FRANCHOT; MARCUS L. BROWN; HENRY NORRIS; GARY D. MAYNARD,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Chief District  
Judge. (8:13-cv-01589-DKC)

---

Submitted: March 27, 2014

Decided: March 31, 2014

---

Before HAMILTON and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judges.\*

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alphonso Dunbar, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

---

\* This opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to  
28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

PER CURIAM:

Alphonso Dunbar seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his complaint without prejudice and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. 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 denying Dunbar's timely filed Rule 59(e) motion was entered on the docket on July 11, 2013. The notice of appeal was filed on October 23, 2013. Because Dunbar 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