

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7524

RAYVERN EARL GREEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN M. MCCALL; MICHAEL MCCALL; A. J. PADULA, Warden,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (6:13-cv-02486-JMC)

Submitted: February 25, 2015

Decided: March 2, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rayvern Earl Green, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rayvern Earl Green seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action against Defendants. Green has also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis and a motion for a copy of Lee Correctional Institution's log books. We deny Green's application to proceed in forma pauperis and his motion for a copy of Lee Correctional Institution's log books, and we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

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).

The district court's judgment was entered on the docket on January 13, 2014. Green did not file his notice of appeal until October 13, 2014.* Accordingly, Green's notice of appeal is untimely. Because Green failed to file a timely notice of appeal or obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny his application for in forma pauperis

* Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 270 (1988).

status and dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We also deny Green's motion for a copy of Lee Correctional Institution's log books. 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