## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-4895

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KEVIN JEROME BUCKMON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (1:07-cr-00678-MBS-1)

Submitted: October 28, 2010 Decided: November 16, 2010

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Beattie B. Ashmore, BEATTIE B. ASHMORE, P.A., Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. John David Rowell, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Kevin Jerome Buckmon seeks to appeal his conviction and sentence. In criminal cases, the defendant must file the notice of appeal within fourteen days after the entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(1)(A). With or without a motion, upon a showing of excusable neglect or good cause, the district court may grant an extension of up to thirty days to file a notice of appeal. Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(4); United States v. Reyes, 759 F.2d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 1985).

The district court entered judgment on February 11, 2009. The notice of appeal was filed on September 21, 2009. Because Buckmon failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> When the judgment was entered, the period was ten days. Buckmon's notice of appeal was untimely under either period.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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).