

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7724

JAMES A. HENSON, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CO/2 LAMBERT; CO/2 N. SOLTAS; CO/2 S. J. MILLER; CO/2 R.
BENNETT; CO/2 C. ORTI; CO/2 J. TART; CO S. MURRAY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge.
(8:12-cv-03271-RWT)

Submitted: February 27, 2014

Decided: March 4, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James A. Henson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Rex Schultz Gordon,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James A. Henson, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006). 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 2, 2013. The notice of appeal was filed on October 10, 2013.* Because Henson 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, 276 (1988).

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

DISMISSED