

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 03-1335

---

ROBERT E. GREEN, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL; THE BALTIMORE CITY  
POLICE DEPARTMENT; SOD DECOY SQUAD; CARL  
STAMBAUGH, Officer; OTHER MEMBERS OF THE  
BALTIMORE POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, District Judge. (CA-99-  
2941-MJG)

---

Submitted: May 20, 2003

Decided: June 4, 2003

---

Before WIDENER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Robert E. Green, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. William Rowe Phelan, Jr.,  
CITY OF BALTIMORE LAW DEPARTMENT, Baltimore, Maryland; Gary Charles  
May, BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT, Baltimore, Maryland; Eileen  
Antoinette Carpenter, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Robert E. Green, Sr., seeks to appeal the district court's order advising Green that additional filings relevant to his closed case, other than a notice of appeal, would be discarded. 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). This appeal period is "mandatory and jurisdictional." Browder v. Director, Dep't of Corr., 434 U.S. 257, 264 (1978) (quoting United States v. Robinson, 361 U.S. 220, 229 (1960)).

The district court's order was entered on the docket on September 17, 2002. The notice of appeal was filed on March 17, 2003. Because Green 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