Travis Davidson v. Robert Ratliff
Appeal: 11-7499 Doc: 22

Filed: 06/14/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7499

TRAVIS LEON DAVIDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ROBERT RATLIFF; NICOLE MACE; WESLEY ROBINSON,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (4:11-cv-01072-RBH)

Submitted: June 7, 2012 Decided: June 14, 2012

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Travis Leon Davidson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 403945042

PER CURIAM:

Travis Leon Davidson seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his civil complaint. 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 22, 2011. The notice of appeal was filed on November 4, 2011.* Because Davidson failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny his pending motions and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

^{*} 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).

Appeal: 11-7499 Doc: 22 Filed: 06/14/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED