

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-7521

STEVE C. CHADWICK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

FRANK BISHOP, JR.; MARYLAND ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (1:17-cv-02394-RDB)

Submitted: February 15, 2018

Decided: February 20, 2018

Before WILKINSON, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Steve Carl Chadwick, Appellant Pro Se. Ryan Robert Dietrich, Assistant Attorney
General, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore,
Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Steve Carl Chadwick 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 September 20, 2017. The notice of appeal was filed on October 26, 2017.* Because Chadwick 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).