

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6473**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

THOMAS MONTRIL BROWN, a/k/a Sparks,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (4:05-cr-00770-TLW-1; 4:08-cv-70050-TLW)

---

Submitted: September 18, 2013

Decided: September 26, 2013

---

Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas Montril Brown, Appellant Pro Se. Alfred William Walker Bethea, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Montril Brown seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013). 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). "[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 September 30, 2011. The notice of appeal was filed on March 14, 2013.\* Because Brown failed to file a timely notice of appeal or obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We deny the motion for appointment of

---

\* 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).

counsel and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED