

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6558

RAYMOND EDMONDS, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN CECILIA REYNOLDS,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Patrick Michael Duffy, Senior District Judge. (2:15-cv-01041-PMD)

Submitted: September 22, 2016

Decided: October 24, 2016

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and NIEMEYER and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Raymond Edmonds, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Melody Jane Brown, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Edmonds, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. 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 order was entered on the docket on March 14, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed on April 14, 2016.* Because Edmonds failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny the motion for a certificate of appealability, 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