UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 17-6887	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	.,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
MELVIN MOORING,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States I Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, Distri		•
Submitted: November 16, 2017		Decided: November 21, 2017
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	and TRAXLER and k	KEENAN, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
Melvin Mooring, Appellant Pro Se Attorney, Washington, D.C., for A		ottingham, Assistant United States
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Melvin Mooring 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 August 11, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed, at the earliest, on June 20, 2017.* Because Mooring failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal. We deny Mooring's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and we dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions areadequately 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, 276 (1988).