James Barnett, Jr. v. Alamance Regional Med. Center
Appeal: 18-6114 Doc: 16 Filed: 04/03/2018 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 406929602

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS	
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT	

	No. 18-6114		
JAMES ANTHONY BARNETT, J	TR.,		
Plaintiff - App	pellant,		
v.			
ALAMANCE REGIONAL MEDIO	CAL CENTER; DR.	BRIAN S. COPE,	
Defendants - A	Appellees.		
Appeal from the United States Dist Greensboro. Loretta C. Biggs, Dis			h Carolina, at
Submitted: March 29, 2018		Decided:	April 3, 2018
Before AGEE and DIAZ, Circuit J	udges, and HAMILT	ON, Senior Circuit J	udge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curis	am opinion.		
James Anthony Barnett, Jr., Appell	ant Pro Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.	

PER CURIAM:

James Anthony Barnett, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and dismissing his complaint without prejudice. 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 May 3, 2016. The notice of appeal was filed on January 8, 2018.* Because Barnett failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss the appeal and deny Bennett's motion to appoint counsel. 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).