

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-2218

FLORENCE AMELIA SMITH,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 00-2277

FLORENCE AMELIA SMITH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LARRY J. WILSON, Judge; ANDREW C. NEISLER,
JR., Attorney; ANNA F. FOSTER, Judge,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western Dis-
trict of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District
Judge. (CA-00-193-1-T, CA-00-160-1-T)

Submitted: January 11, 2001

Decided: January 17, 2001

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Florence Amelia Smith, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Florence Amelia Smith appeals the district court's orders dismissing her cases, denying her motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and ordering that any of her future district court pleadings be reviewed by the court prior to filing. We have reviewed the records in both cases and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Smith's motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeals as frivolous on the reasoning of the district court. See Smith v. North Carolina, No. CA-00-193-1-T (W.D.N.C. Aug. 29 & Sept. 13, 2000); Smith v. Wilson, No. CA-00-160-1-T (W.D.N.C. July 25 & Aug. 10, 2000).^{*} We also deny Smith's motion for appointment of counsel filed in No. 00-2277. 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

^{*} Although the district court's August 29, 2000, order in No. 00-2218 is marked as "filed" on August 28, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on August 29, 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. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).