

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6031

JOSEPH E. MACON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHARLES R. BEDDINGFIELD, their official capacities as police officers for the City of Williamston, County of Anderson; D. B. BROOKS, their official capacities as police officers for the City of Williamston, County of Anderson; DAVID J. ROGERS, official capacity as dogcatcher for the City of Williamston, County of Anderson,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge. (8:02-cv-03734-HFF)

Submitted: May 19, 2011

Decided: May 24, 2011

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph E. Macon, Appellant Pro Se. Andrew Lindemann, DAVIDSON & LINDEMANN, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Joseph E. Macon seeks to appeal the district court's text order denying his "Motion to Rehear and Squash this Prejudice Opinion." In the motion, Macon essentially sought reconsideration of the district court's June 8, 2004 order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. 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 text order was entered on the docket on December 1, 2010. The notice of appeal was filed on January 3, 2011. Because Macon 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED