UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•		
	No. 17-7507	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	۸,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
DONNA JEAN JENKINS,		
Defendant - A	appellant.	
Appeal from the United States D Harrisonburg. Michael F. Urbansl 5:16-cv-81158-MFU-RSB)		
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	and SHEDD and HAI	RRIS, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
Donna Jean Jenkins, Appellant P. Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNIT Elizabeth G. Wright, UNITED S D.C., for Appellee.	ΓED STATES ATTO	DRNEY, Charlottesville, Virginia;

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donna Jean Jenkins seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion to vacate. 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 29, 2017. The notice of appeal was filed on November 6, 2017.* Because Jenkins 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 district court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c); *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).