

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6863**

---

JOHN WAYNE SIMMONS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ENNIS OATES,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:12-hc-02180-FL)

---

Submitted: October 21, 2014

Decided: October 24, 2014

---

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Wayne Simmons, Appellant Pro Se. Mary Carla Babb, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Wayne Simmons 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 thirty 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 September 17, 2013. The notice of appeal was filed on May 30, 2014.\* Because Simmons 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 further note that the appeal is duplicative because Simmons has previously appealed the district court's order denying his § 2254 petition. We dispense with oral

---

\* 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).

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