

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 26-50116

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 1, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

LISA LEWIS-WATSON,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

ADAM R. TELLE, *Acting Secretary of the Army*; JUSTIN R. SIMMONS,
United States Attorney; TODD WALLACE BLANCHE, *U.S. Attorney*
General; D. JOHN SAUER, *Solicitor General, U.S. Department of Justice*,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 5:22-CV-1289

Before JONES, HO, and ENGELHARDT, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Lisa Lewis-Watson filed a civil action against government defendants, alleging that she was denied consideration for employment on discriminatory grounds and asserting that her 2013 termination from the Department of the Army and resulting loss of medical benefits was illegal; she also raised allegations relating to social security benefits. The district court dismissed

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 26-50116

her complaint, and this court affirmed. *Lewis-Watson v. Wormuth*, No. 23-50538, 2024 WL 277725, at *1-3 (5th Cir. Jan. 25, 2024) (unpublished). Lewis-Watson subsequently filed numerous and repetitive postjudgment motions. The district court ultimately imposed monetary sanctions and stated that it would not consider any pleadings filed by Lewis-Watson until the sanctions were paid. On February 9, 2026, Lewis-Watson filed a notice of appeal, and she moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP).

A timely notice of appeal is a jurisdictional requirement in a civil action. *Bowles v. Russell*, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007). Lewis-Watson's notice of appeal should have been filed within 60 days of the entry of the order or judgment she sought to appeal. FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(1)(B). The district court issued no orders in the 60-day period preceding her notice of appeal. Lewis-Watson stated in her notice of appeal that she sought to challenge a notice from the district court clerk that no action would be taken on a motion she had filed in light of the sanction order. This is not an appealable order of the district court, and the notice of appeal was filed more than 60 days after the issuance of the sanction order and is thus untimely. *See Bowles*, 551 U.S. at 214; FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(1)(B). Although Lewis-Watson filed an additional notice of appeal and her appellate brief within 60 days of orders entered by the district court denying still more motions, she did not designate those rulings by the district court in these documents and is thus unable to show that they serve as timely notices of appeal from those orders. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 3(c)(1)(B).

As Lewis-Watson has not filed a timely notice of appeal, her appeal is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(1)(B); *Bowles*, 551 U.S. at 214. Her IFP motion is DENIED.