UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1189

HILDA B. JACKSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLINAS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM; JEFFREY NORVILLE, Director; CHARLES CASE, Manager; JENNIFER PASSANTINO, Supervisor; HELEN MOORE, Employee Relations Manager,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. David C. Keesler, Magistrate Judge. (3:06-cv-00279-DCK)

Submitted: April 24, 2008

Before KING and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hilda B. Jackson, Appellant Pro Se. Kimberly Quade Cacheris, Benjamin R. Holland, MCGUIREWOODS, LLP, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Decided: April 29, 2008

PER CURIAM:

Hilda B. Jackson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her claims of employment discrimination.* 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 December 6, 2007. The notice of appeal was filed on January 31, 2008. Because Jackson failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we grant Appellees' motion to dismiss 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

^{*}This case was decided by the magistrate judge upon consent of the parties under 28 USC § 636(c) (2000).