

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-2474

RONNIE CLARKE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PETERSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL; KENNETH L. PRITCHETT, Board Chairman, Petersburg City Public School Board Member; STEVEN L. PIERCE, SR., Vice Chair, Petersburg City Public School Board Member; FRED B. WILSON, Petersburg City Public School Board Member; KENNETH LEWIS, Dr., Petersburg City School Board Member; ELSIE R. JARMON, Dr., Petersburg City Public School Board Member; MARY JANE HENDRICKS, Petersburg City Public School Board Member; BERNARD LUNDY, JR., Petersburg City Public School Board Member; ALVERA PARRISH, Dr., Current Superintendent, Petersburg City Public School; JAMES VICTORY, Dr., Former Superintendent and current Executive Director ARGS; PETERSBURG CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT, Acting Director; PATRICK BINGHAM, Dr., Former Human Resources Director, Petersburg City Public School Human Resources Department; WILLIAM "BILL" RAWLES, Director, Petersburg City Public School Technology Department; TRACIE COLEMAN, Mrs., Budget and Finance Department Director, Former Technology Director, Petersburg City Public School Budget and Finance,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:11-cv-00164-REP)

Submitted: March 28, 2013

Decided: April 1, 2013

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronnie Clarke, Appellant Pro Se. Zachary D. Cohen, William Woodul Tunner, THOMPSON MCMULLAN PC, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronnie Clarke seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss his claims brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 2003 & Supp. 2012). 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). Furthermore, "[a] bare notice of appeal should not be construed as a motion for extension of time, where no request for additional time is manifest." Shah v. Hutto, 722 F.2d 1167, 1168-69 (4th Cir. 1983) (en banc).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on October 24, 2012. The notice of appeal was filed on November 27, 2012. Because Clarke failed to file a timely notice of appeal or 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