## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
_	No. 22-6830	
TODD E. COLLINS,		
Petitioner - Ap	opellant,	
v.		
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,		
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
-		
Appeal from the United States Dist Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, 1		
Submitted: December 20, 2022		Decided: December 27, 2022
Before NIEMEYER and QUATTL Judge.	LEBAUM, Circuit Ju	idges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Todd E. Collins, Appellant Pro Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Todd Collins, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 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 May 11, 2021 but did not set forth its judgment in a separate document, and so the court's order was deemed entered 150 days later, on October 8, 2021. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(c)(2)(B); Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(7)(A)(ii). Collins filed the notice of appeal on July 13, 2022.\* Because Collins failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

<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 Collins 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).

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**