

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6950

KASEAN DAMONT BRYSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SIDNEY HARKLEROAD,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., District Judge. (1:10-cv-00222-RJC)

Submitted: August 21, 2014

Decided: August 26, 2014

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kasean Damont Bryson, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kasean Damont Bryson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his supplemental motion to alter or amend the judgment filed in his habeas proceedings. 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 April 11, 2014. The notice of appeal was filed on June 15, 2014.* Because Bryson 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