

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6428**

---

PEARLIE INGRAM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (9:14-cv-04771-CMC)

---

Submitted: December 15, 2015

Decided: January 6, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Pearlie Ingram, Appellant Pro Se. Benjamin Neale Garner, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pearlie Lee Ingram appeals the district court's order dismissing his petition for writ of error coram nobis. We affirm.

A writ of error coram nobis can be used to vacate a conviction when a fundamental error resulted in conviction and no other means of relief is available. United States v. Denedo, 556 U.S. 904, 911 (2009); United States v. Akinsade, 686 F.3d 248, 252 (4th Cir. 2012). But see Carlisle v. United States, 517 U.S. 416, 429 (1996) ("[I]t is difficult to conceive of a situation in a federal criminal case today where a writ of coram nobis would be necessary or appropriate." (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted)). We review for abuse of discretion the district court's decision to deny coram nobis relief. Bereano v. United States, 706 F.3d 568, 575 (4th Cir. 2013).

Applying these standards, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying Ingram's petition for writ of coram nobis. Accordingly, we deny Ingram's motions to consider new evidence and for oral argument and affirm the judgment of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED