

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-7937

---

WILLIAM PERRY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MR. BELCHER, Southampton County "Magistrate",

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, District Judge. (2:06-cv-00428-RBS)

---

Submitted: April 19, 2007

Decided: April 24, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Perry, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Perry seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b) (2000). 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 July 27, 2006. The notice of appeal was filed on August 30, 2006.\* Because Perry failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

---

\*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).