

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7765**

---

FRANK E. GREEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

J. PRITTS, CO II; J. GORDON, CO III; R. RITCHIE, CO II;  
CHRIST WEDLOCK, CO III,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District  
Judge. (1:14-cv-00868-JFM)

---

Submitted: April 21, 2016

Decided: April 25, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Frank Edward Green, Appellant Pro Se. Stephanie Judith Lane-  
Weber, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Frank Edward Green seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action and denying his motion for reconsideration. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Parties are accorded 30 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 final order was entered on the docket on September 24, 2015. The notice of appeal was filed on October 28, 2015.\* Because Green 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