

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-7585**

---

CHESTER LILLEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

UNNAMED RESPONDENT; CENTRAL PRISON HOSP.,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III,  
Chief District Judge. (5:16-hc-02036-D)

---

Submitted: January 17, 2017

Decided: January 20, 2017

---

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Chester Lambert Lilley, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Chester Lambert Lilley, Jr. seeks to appeal the district court's order and judgment dismissing Lilley's 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 October 3, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed on November 9, 2016.\* Because Lilley 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, deny Lilley's motions for appointment of counsel, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

---

\* 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).

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

DISMISSED