

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7235

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALBERT CHARLES BURGESS, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Graham C. Mullen, Senior District Judge. (1:09-cr-00017-GCM-DLH-1; 1:12-cv-00375-GCM)

Submitted: November 19, 2015

Decided: November 24, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Albert Charles Burgess, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, Melissa Louise Rikard, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Albert Charles Burgess, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. 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 60 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 February 26, 2015. The notice of appeal was filed on August 3, 2015.* Because Burgess 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 in the

* 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. See Fed. R. App. P. 4(c); Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).

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

DISMISSED