

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-1098**

---

DJIBY NAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

2012, INC., d/b/a College Park Exxon; DOES 1-10,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.  
Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:15-cv-01931-DKC)

---

Submitted: May 29, 2018

Decided: June 13, 2018

---

Before WILKINSON, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Djiby Nam, Appellant Pro Se. Charles H. Fleischer, OPPENHEIMER, FLEISCHER &  
QUIGGLE, PC, Bethesda, Maryland, for Appellee 2012, Inc.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Djiby Nam appeals the district court's order denying his motion to reopen the appeal period pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court.\* *Nam v. 2012, Inc.*, No. 8:15-cv-01931-DKC (D. Md. Jan. 5, 2018). 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.

*AFFIRMED*

---

\* Insofar as Nam challenges the district court's order granting summary judgment to 2012, Inc., we lack jurisdiction over that order because Nam failed to note a timely appeal from the district court's summary judgment order and the district court did not err in denying Nam's motion to reopen the appeal period. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2107(a) (2012) (stating that parties are accorded 30 days after entry of district court's final judgment or order to note appeal); Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A) (implementing § 2107(a)); *Hamer v. Neighborhood Hous. Servs. of Chi.*, 138 S. Ct. 13, 17 (2017) (recognizing that "a provision governing the time to appeal in a civil action qualifies as jurisdictional . . . if Congress sets the time").