

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-6688

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ISAAC PERRY, a/k/a Ike,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:93-cr-00042-F)

Submitted: July 24, 2007

Decided: August 1, 2007

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Isaac Perry, Appellant Pro Se. Rudolf A. Renfer, Jr., John Eric Evenson, II, Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Isaac Perry seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion seeking immediate release from prison. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than sixty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), 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 February 28, 2006. The notice of appeal was filed on March 20, 2007.* 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

*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, 276 (1988).

materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED