

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-6529**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROBERT FERDINAND ANNEHEIM, a/k/a Bobby,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L.  
Voorhees, District Judge. (5:99-cr-00020-RLV-2)

---

Submitted: August 20, 2009

Decided: August 26, 2009

---

Before WILKINSON and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,  
Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Robert Ferdinand Anneheim, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Jack  
Higdon, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh,  
North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Anneheim seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion for reduction of sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582 (2006). In criminal cases, the defendant must file the notice of appeal within ten days after the entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(1)(A); see United States v. Alvarez, 210 F.3d 309, 310 (5th Cir. 2000) (holding that § 3582 proceeding is criminal in nature and ten-day appeal period applies). With or without a motion, upon a showing of excusable neglect or good cause, the district court may grant an extension of up to thirty days to file a notice of appeal. Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(4); United States v. Reyes, 759 F.2d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 1985).

The district court entered its order denying the motion for reduction of sentence on March 4, 2009. Anneheim filed the notice of appeal on March 21, at the earliest,\* after the ten-day period expired but within the thirty-day excusable neglect period. Because the notice of appeal was filed within the excusable neglect period, we remand the case to the district court for the court to determine whether Anneheim has shown

---

\* 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).

excusable neglect or good cause warranting an extension of the ten-day appeal period. The record, as supplemented, will then be returned to this court for further consideration.

REMANDED