

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6880**

---

ANTHONY ANDERSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen,  
District Judge. (2:13-cv-00223-AWA-LRL)

---

Submitted: October 16, 2014

Decided: October 20, 2014

---

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony Anderson, Appellant Pro Se. Eugene Paul Murphy, OFFICE  
OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Anderson seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 March 24, 2014. The notice of appeal was filed on May 6, 2014.\* Because Anderson 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

---

\* 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, 276 (1988).

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

DISMISSED