

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7950**

---

JEREMY DANIEL RUSSOM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

KEITH WHITENER, Administrator, Marion Correctional  
Institution,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Frank D. Whitney,  
Chief District Judge. (5:14-cv-00167-FDW)

---

Submitted: February 25, 2016

Decided: March 2, 2016

---

Before SHEDD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit  
Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jeremy Daniel Russom, Appellant Pro Se. Nicholas George Vlahos,  
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeremy Daniel Russom seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. 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 August 31, 2015. The notice of appeal was filed on November 29, 2015.\* Because Russom failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

---

\* 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).

are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED