

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-4122**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

NATHANIEL GREEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (CR-04-677)

---

Submitted: September 29, 2005

Decided: October 5, 2005

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nathaniel Green, Appellant Pro Se. Alan Hechtkopf, John Hinton, III, M. Kendall Day, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Nathaniel Green appeals his conviction for several counts of filing false tax documents, in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7206(1) (2000), aiding and assisting in the preparation of false tax documents, in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7206(2) (2000), and obstruction of justice, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (2000). Green was sentenced to thirty-six months of imprisonment, to be followed by three years of supervised release.

Green, representing himself on appeal as he did below, raises several challenges to his conviction. Because these arguments are baseless,\* we deny Green's motion for transcript at government expense and affirm Green's conviction. 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

---

\*Green argues: (1) that he removed any "presumption of power of attorney that the United States government" had on him; (2) that he declared that he is of the Washitaw Muurs nationality, rather than a U.S. citizen; (3) that he revoked all signatures and powers of attorney of previously filed W-4 forms and state and local tax forms; (4) that he emancipated himself from his government-issued birth certificate in accordance with the Uniform Commercial Code; and (5) that the government's use of his name violates a copyright as the name is a trade name under the Uniform Commercial Code.