

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6422

MICHAEL ANTHONY JONES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES; BOP AGENCY; CHARLES E. SAMUELS, JR., Director; J. F. CARAWAY, Regional Director; C. EICHENLAUB, Regional Director; TERRY O'BRIEN, Warden; W. ODOM, Associate Warden; DR. GREGORY S. MIMS, II, Clinical Director; JAMIE HAMILTON, Hospital Administrator; C. LAFLUER, Assistant Hospital Administrator,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Clarksburg. Irene M. Keeley, District Judge. (1:15-cv-00050-IMK-RWT)

Submitted: July 27, 2017

Decided: August 1, 2017

Before AGEE and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Anthony Jones, Appellant Pro Se. Erin K. Reisenweber, Assistant United States Attorney, Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Anthony Jones seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his federal civil rights and Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) complaint. 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 December 20, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed, at the earliest, on March 27, 2017.* Because Jones 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 materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

* 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).