

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-4531

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

VINCENT EUGENE LINEBERGER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Chief District Judge. (CR-96-11)

Submitted: February 11, 2004

Decided: February 27, 2004

Before WILLIAMS, MICHAEL, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Vincent Eugene Lineberger, Appellant Pro Se. Robert James Conrad, Jr., United States Attorney; Holly Anne Pierson, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In a prior appeal by Vincent Eugene Lineberger, we vacated his criminal judgment and remanded the case to the district court for resentencing for the limited purpose of stating a definite date by which Lineberger's sentence was to begin. See United States v. Golden, 795 F.2d 19, 21 (3d Cir. 1986). On remand, the district court amended the judgment to state that Lineberger was to "begin his sentence on October 23, 1998." The court also corrected a clerical mistake in the original judgment order and changed the order in which the counts were listed in several sections of the judgment. Lineberger now appeals from the amended judgment and from the district court's order denying his motion to vacate the amended judgment.* Our review of the record and the district court's orders has disclosed no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm. Lineberger has raised numerous issues on appeal. However, because these issues are outside the scope of the remand, we decline to address them. 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

*Although Lineberger completed the service of his term of imprisonment, this appeal is not moot because he is still subject to a three-year term of supervised release.