

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-6025**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ARTHUR RAYMOND PRINCE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  
James K. Bredar, Chief District Judge. (1:18-cr-00313-JKB-2; 1:19-cv-01591-JKB)

---

Submitted: May 19, 2022

Decided: May 24, 2022

---

Before MOTZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Arthur Raymond Prince, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Arthur Raymond Prince seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his amended 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. 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 in a civil case, 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 entered its order on January 21, 2020. Prince filed the notice of appeal on February 5, 2021.\* Because Prince failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny Prince's motion to appoint counsel 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 handwritten date appearing on the notice of appeal is the earliest date Prince 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).