

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-6218

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

BRYANT PIERRE BOONE, a/k/a Ice,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (CR-96-21-1-A, CA-98-1574-AM)

Submitted: May 11, 2000

Decided: May 18, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bryant Pierre Boone, Appellant Pro Se. William Edward Fitzpatrick, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Bryant Pierre Boone seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 1999) and denying his various discovery motions, denying his motion for reconsideration, with additional discovery motions, and denying his motion for a certificate of appealability. We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court. See United States v. Boone, Nos. CR-96-21-1-A: CA-98-1574-AM (E.D. Va. May 12, June 7, & Oct. 21, 1999).^{*} Boone's motions to compel the government to produce documents are denied. 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 order denying Boone's motion for a certificate of appealability is marked as "filed" on October 19, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on October 21, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date 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).