

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-4044

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

BARRINGTON ISAACS, a/k/a Orville Griswold,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (CR-98-356)

Submitted: February 18, 2004

Decided: February 27, 2004

Before WIDENER, WILKINSON and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Andrew D. Grimes, ANDREW D. GRIMES, P.A., Summerville, South Carolina, for Appellant. J. Strom Thurmond, Jr., United States Attorney, Beth Drake, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In 1999, Barrington Isaacs was convicted and sentenced for participation in a conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute and to distribute cocaine and cocaine base, conspiracy to import cocaine, and conspiracy to engage in money laundering. In December 2002, the district court entered an amended judgment for correction of sentence pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 36 to include an omitted reference to an order of forfeiture. Isaacs now seeks to appeal the amended criminal judgment.

Rule 36 provides that “[a]fter giving any notice it considers appropriate, the court may at any time correct a clerical error in a judgment, order, or other part of the record, or correct an error in the record arising from oversight or omission.” We have reviewed the transcript of the sentencing hearing and the order of forfeiture that was executed by the district court at the hearing, and find that the court properly amended the judgment to accurately reflect its intention at sentencing to include the forfeiture in the judgment. We have also reviewed Isaacs’s claim that the district court failed to provide him with adequate notice of the Government’s motion to modify the criminal judgment and find no reversible error in this regard. Accordingly, we affirm the amended criminal judgment. 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.

AFFIRMED