

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6050**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JULIEN K. DILKS, a/k/a Julien Modica, MPH, a/k/a Julian  
Modica, MPP,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, Senior  
District Judge. (7:93-cr-00091-jct-mfu-1; 7:10-cv-80286-jct-  
mfu)

---

Submitted: April 21, 2011

Decided: April 27, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam  
opinion.

---

Julien K. Dilks, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Linn Eckert,  
Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Julien K. Dilks seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion, construing the motion as a petition for a writ of error coram nobis, and dismissing it as an abuse of the writ. Dilks also seeks to appeal the district court's order imposing a pre-filing injunction against him. We affirm in part and dismiss in part.

When the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the notice of appeal must be filed no more than sixty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to note an appeal, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B), 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 dismissal order was entered on the docket on October 27, 2010. The notice of appeal was filed on January 10, 2011. Because Dilks failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss this portion the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the notice of appeal was not timely filed.

Turning to the court's order imposing a pre-filing injunction, Dilks timely appealed that order. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Dilks' informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's imposition of the pre-filing injunction, Dilks has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. Accordingly, we affirm. 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART;  
DISMISSED IN PART