UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7283

WILLIAM WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE, Warden; DAN PATTERSON; N. BARBER, Chaplin; BOBBY HANKERSON, Chaplin,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (9:10-cv-03211-JFA)

Submitted: October 23, 2012 Decided: November 6, 2012

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Washington, Appellant Pro Se. William Henry Davidson II, David C. Plyler, DAVIDSON & LINDEMANN, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Washington seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) 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 November 29, 2011. The notice of appeal was filed on July 10, 2012.* Washington failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period. The notice of appeal accordingly was untimely, and we therefore grant the Appellees' motion to dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

 $^{^{\}ast}$ The notice of appeal is hand-dated July 10, 2012, and we assume it was deposited in the institutional internal mail system on that date. See Fed. R. App. P. $4(\mbox{c})(1)$

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

DISMISSED