

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7436

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ADRIAN PARKER, a/k/a Great One, a/k/a Rock,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney,
Chief District Judge. (3:10-cr-00087-FDW-4; 3:14-cv-00676-FDW)

Submitted: December 17, 2015

Decided: December 22, 2015

Before DIAZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Adrian Parker, Appellant Pro Se. Steven R. Kaufman, Assistant
United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Adrian Parker 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 May 18, 2015. The notice of appeal was filed on September 1, 2015.* Because Parker failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny a certificate of appealability 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