

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6022

DOUGLAS FAUCONIER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL
SERVICES; DOUGLAS F. GANSLER, The Attorney General of the
State of Maryland,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, District Judge. (8:11-
cv-01966-RWT)

Submitted: February 7, 2013

Decided: February 14, 2013

Before MOTZ, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Douglas Fauconier, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE
OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Douglas Fauconier seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. 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 December 1, 2011. The notice of appeal was filed on December 27, 2012.* Because Fauconier 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

* 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).

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

DISMISSED