

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-6241**

---

ANGELO D. LANE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

ERNEST SUTTON, Superintendent,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:05-hc-00081-BO)

---

Submitted: August 31, 2006

Decided: September 6, 2006

---

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Angelo D. Lane, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Angelo D. Lane seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. 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 March 8, 2005. According Lane the benefit of Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988), the notice of appeal was filed on January 29, 2006. Because Lane 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 are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED