

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7044

RAMONE STEPHON JONES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:11-cv-01107-AW)

Submitted: November 15, 2011

Decided: November 18, 2011

Before NIEMEYER and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ramone Stephon Jones, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ramone Stephon Jones seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing Jones' 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition for lack of jurisdiction. 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). "[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement." Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on July 1, 2011. The notice of appeal was filed on August 4, 2011.* Because Jones 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

*Jones did not date his notice of appeal. For the purpose of this appeal, we assume that the date appearing on the envelope containing 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).

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

DISMISSED