## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

·	_	
<u>-</u>	No. 21-7101	
DONQUAVIOUS DASHON DAV	TIS,	
Petitioner - Ap	pellant,	
V.		
WARDEN OF PERRY CORRECT	TIONAL INSTITUT	ION,
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (5:20-cv-02674-RMG)		
Submitted: November 18, 2021		Decided: November 22, 2021
Before MOTZ, THACKER, and H.	ARRIS, Circuit Judg	es.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Donquavious DaShon Davis, Appe	llant Pro Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Donquavious DaShon Davis seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying relief on Davis' 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

In civil cases, parties have 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 entered its order on March 18, 2021. Davis filed the notice of appeal on July 9, 2021.\* Because Davis 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** 

<sup>\*</sup> For the purpose of this appeal, we assume that the postmark date appearing on the envelope containing the notice of appeal is the earliest date Davis could have delivered the notice to prison officials for mailing to the court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1); *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).