

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-7372**

---

CHRISTOPHER A. ODOM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR, CHARLESTON COUNTY DETENTION CENTER,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (5:17-cv-01906-RMG)

---

Submitted: February 22, 2018

Decided: March 22, 2018

---

Before TRAXLER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher A. Odom, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher A. Odom seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying Odom's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) petition. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded 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's order was entered on the docket on August 24, 2017. The notice of appeal was filed on October 6, 2017.\* Because Odom failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny Odom's motion for initial hearing en banc and dismiss the appeal. 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*

---

\* 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).