

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7367

DEANGELO WOODEN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (2:11-cv-00981-JFA)

Submitted: November 21, 2013

Decided: November 26, 2013

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Deangelo Wooden, Appellant Pro Se. William Edgar Salter, III, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Deangelo Wooden seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and denying relief on 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 August 24, 2012. The notice of appeal was filed on August 21, 2013.* Because Wooden 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 presented

* 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).

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

DISMISSED