## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

<u>.</u>	No. 24-6105	-
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	•	
Plaintiff - App	oellee,	
v.		
SHONTAVIS DAVIS,		
Defendant - Appellant.		
Appeal from the United States I Columbia. J. Michelle Childs, D JMC)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Submitted: April 11, 2024		Decided: April 16, 2024
Before AGEE and QUATTLEBAU	JM, Circuit Judges,	and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Shontavis Davis, Appellant Pro Se.		•
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.		

## PER CURIAM:

Shontavis Davis seeks to appeal the district court's order denying Davis' motions to vacate his sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 and motion for an extension of time to file a 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 November 23, 2021. Davis filed the notice of appeal on February 1, 2024.\* 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 date appearing on 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).