

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-2097**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JOHN WESLEY FAIRCLOTH,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. Malcolm J. Howard, District Judge. (CR-95-72)

---

Submitted: December 14, 2000

Decided: December 19, 2000

---

Before WIDENER, WILKINS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Wesley Faircloth, Appellant Pro Se. Janice McKenzie Cole, United States Attorney, Rudolf A. Renfer, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

John Wesley Faircloth appeals the district court's orders in relation to the Government's collection of his criminal fine. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. United States v. Faircloth, No. CR-95-72 (E.D.N.C. Aug. 1, 2000).<sup>\*</sup> In addition, we deny all pending motions and 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

---

<sup>\*</sup> Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on July 25, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on August 1, 2000. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).