

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1630**

---

EMMANUEL UZOMA; EMELIA UZOMA,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

BARCLAYS, PLC; EQUIFIRST CORPORATION; THE BANK OF NEW YORK  
MELLON TRUST; COMPANY; JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., other JP  
Morgan Chase, NA; HOMEQ SERVICING CORPORATION, d/b/a  
Barclays Capital Real Estate, Inc., d/b/a Ocwen Loan  
Servicing, LLC, other Homeq Corporation; STATEBRIDGE  
COMPANY, LLC; BARCLAYS CAPITAL REAL ESTATE, INC.; OCWEN  
LOAN SERVICING, LLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge.  
(8:13-cv-00977-RWT)

---

Submitted: August 20, 2014

Decided: August 28, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Emmanuel Uzoma, Emelia Uzoma, Appellants Pro Se. David Block  
Bergman, ARNOLD & PORTER, LLP, Washington, D.C.; Chad King, John  
Sears Simcox, SIMCOX & BARCLAY, Annapolis, Maryland; Christopher  
Michele Corchiarino, GOODELL DEVRIES LEECH & DANN, LLP,

Baltimore, Maryland; Joshua Tropper, BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,  
CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, PC, Atlanta, Georgia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Emmanuel and Emelia Uzoma seek to appeal the district court's order granting the Defendants' motions to dismiss their civil action. Defendants have moved to 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 March 27, 2014. The notice of appeal was filed on June 24, 2014. Because Appellants failed to file a timely notice of appeal or obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we grant the motions to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and 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