

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1436

NATALYA HAMPEL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND; UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND; OFFICE ON
AGING; RICHARD LEWIS, M.D.; DEBORAH SKILLMAN; UJNAI IMAIA, MD;
SAFIYAH ARDAM SALMAN, MD; ASHLEY KIMBER, LCPC; PHIL LEMBO,
LCSWC; MISS MONA; BRADLEY STOVER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Stephanie A. Gallagher, District Judge. (1:22-cv-01115-SAG)

Submitted: January 30, 2024

Decided: February 2, 2024

Before KING, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Natalya Tamara Hampel, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Anthony Damiano, SHAW,
BARNES & DAMIANO, P.A., Hunt Valley, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Natalya Hampel seeks to appeal the district court’s orders dismissing her complaint and denying reconsideration. We dismiss in part and affirm in part.

In civil cases, parties have 30 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 entered its dismissal order on January 5, 2023. Hampel filed the notice of appeal on April 20, 2023. Because Hampel failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period,^{*} we dismiss the appeal as to the dismissal order.

Turning to the district court’s denial of Hampel’s motion for reconsideration, from which Hampel timely appealed, we have reviewed the record and discern no reversible error. Therefore, we affirm the district court’s order. *Hampel v. Maryland*, No. 1:22-cv-01115-SAG (D. Md. Apr. 10, 2023). 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 IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*

^{*} While Hampel filed a letter on February 8, 2023, that the district court construed as a motion for reconsideration, it did not toll the appeal period because it was not filed within 28 days of the entry of the underlying dismissal order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4).