

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7877**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DENNIS MERRIMON WATERS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge. (1:01-cr-00048-LHT-10)

---

Submitted: January 14, 2010

Decided: January 21, 2010

---

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dennis Merrimon Waters, Appellant Pro Se. Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dennis Merrimon Waters seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion seeking relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). 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. See Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205 (2007).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on May 18, 2009. The notice of appeal was filed on September 28, 2009.\* Because Waters 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

---

\*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 (1988).

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

DISMISSED