

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-7837**

---

LARRY S. WILLIAMS-EL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES DUNNING, Sheriff, Alexandria Detention Center; RICHARD R. RUSCAK, Undersheriff, Alexandria Detention Center; DEBRA L. PIERSON, Captain of Security, Alexandria Detention Center; JOHN L. GRIGGS, Captain for Inmate Service, Alexandria Detention Center; SERGEANT REYNOLDS, Watch Commander (A-1), Alexandria Detention Center; DEPUTY JACOBSON (A-1), Alexandria Detention Center,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

C. S. CHAPMAN, Deputy, (A-1), Alexandria Detention Center; EDWARD MURRAY, Director for the Department of Corrections,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert E. Payne, District Judge. (CA-93-698-N)

---

Submitted: March 21, 1996

Decided: April 10, 1996

---

---

Before NIEMEYER and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Larry S. Williams-El, Appellant Pro Se. Jack L. Gould, Fairfax,  
Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant noted this appeal outside the thirty-day appeal period established by Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1), failed to obtain an extension of the appeal period within the additional thirty-day period provided by Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), and is not entitled to relief under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). The time periods established by Fed. R. App. P. 4 are "mandatory and jurisdictional." Browder v. Director, Dep't of Corrections, 434 U.S. 257, 264 (1978) (quoting United States v. Robinson, 361 U.S. 220, 229 (1960)). The district court entered its order on Oct. 4, 1995; Appellant's notice of appeal was filed on Nov. 15, 1995. Appellant's failure to note a timely appeal or obtain an extension of the appeal period deprives this court of jurisdiction to consider this case. We therefore 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