

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-4157

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

CHRISTOPHER R. WOODBERRY,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 03-4333

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

CHRISTOPHER R. WOODBERRY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. C. Weston Houck, Senior District Judge; Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (CR-99-168; CR-02-40)

Submitted: December 22, 2003

Decided: February 3, 2004

Before WILLIAMS, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher R. Woodberry, Appellant Pro Se. William Earl Day, II,
Rose Mary Parham, Assistant United States Attorneys, Florence,
South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Woodberry appeals from the two judgments of the district court convicting him of conspiring to distribute cocaine and ecstasy and possessing a firearm as a convicted felon, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841, 846 (2000), and 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) (2000) (No. 03-4333); and revoking his supervised release on a prior conviction for conspiring to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371 (2000) (No. 03-4157). Finding no error, we affirm.

Woodberry claims that the district court erred in denying his various motions to withdraw his guilty plea. Our review of the plea colloquy discloses that it was conducted in full compliance with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11. Moreover, Woodberry makes no claim of actual innocence and raises no additional factors that call into question the validity of his plea. Accordingly we deny relief on this claim. See United States v. Moore, 931 F.2d 245, 248 (4th Cir. 1991).

Woodberry also claims that the district court erred in denying his motion for recusal and that it became an "advocate for the plea agreement." (Appellant's informal br. at 18). Nothing in our review of the record of the district court discloses a reasonable factual basis for doubting the judge's impartiality. Consequently, we deny relief on this claim. See In re Beard, 811 F.2d 818, 827 (4th Cir. 1987).

We affirm the judgment of the district court. We also deny Woodberry's pending motions for discovery, to correct transcripts, to supplement the record on appeal with the name of a confidential informant, for a copy of the Government's information, to hold the case in abeyance pending resolution of outstanding motions, to file a second supplement seeking an audiotape copy of his sentencing proceeding, and to compel a Government response to pending motions. 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