

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7113**

---

DEMETRIUS LYDELL BRYANT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN ERIC D. WILSON,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III,  
Chief District Judge. (5:12-hc-02309-D)

---

Submitted: October 22, 2013

Decided: October 25, 2013

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Demetrius Lydell Bryant, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Demetrius Lydell Bryant seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing for lack of subject matter jurisdiction 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 June 6, 2013. The notice of appeal was filed on July 10, 2013.\* Because Bryant failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

---

\*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).

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

DISMISSED