UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-7546
MICHAEL ANTHONY PAIGE,
Petitioner - Appellant,
v.
KATIE POOLE,
Respondent - Appellee.
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:16-cv-00618-CCE-JEP)
Submitted: January 30, 2018 Decided: February 2, 2018
Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.
Michael Anthony Paige, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, Nicholaos George Vlahos, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Anthony Paige seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying relief on 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 July 10, 2017. The notice of appeal was filed on November 14, 2017.* Because Paige 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 and 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).