UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-7603

JAMES OVERTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

THEODIS BECK,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, Chief District Judge. (5:05-hc-00789-FL)

Submitted: December 14, 2006

Before MICHAEL, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Overton, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Decided: December 22, 2006

PER CURIAM:

James Overton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on 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." <u>Browder v. Dir., Dep't of Corr.</u>, 434 U.S. 257, 264 (1978) (quoting <u>United States v. Robinson</u>, 361 U.S. 220, (1960)).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on July 18, 2006. The notice of appeal was filed on September 7, 2006.* Because Overton 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); <u>Houston v. Lack</u>, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).