

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-7325**

---

COURTNEY D. HAMMOND,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

PAUL LANTEIGNE, Sheriff, VA Beach Correctional  
Center,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior  
District Judge. (3:06-cv-00266-RLW)

---

Submitted: December 21, 2006

Decided: January 4, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Courtney D. Hammond, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Courtney D. Hammond seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his action for failure to comply with a court order. 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). This appeal period is "mandatory and jurisdictional." Browder v. Dir., Dep't of Corr., 434 U.S. 257, 264 (1978) (quoting United States v. Robinson, 361 U.S. 220, 229 (1960)).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on May 30, 2006. The notice of appeal was filed on July 18, 2006.\* Because Hammond failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

---

\*For the purpose of this appeal, we assume that the date appearing on the notice of appeal is the earliest date it could have been properly delivered to prison officials for mailing to the court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c); Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED