

Filed: March 19, 1997

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

Nos. 96-6792(L)
(CA-95-698)

John Robert Betts,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

Ronald J. Angelone, Director,

Respondent - Appellee.

O R D E R

The Court amends its opinion filed January 3, 1997, as follows:

On page 2, section 2 -- the status line is corrected to read "Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor

Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-6792

JOHN ROBERT BETTS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 96-7343

JOHN ROBERT BETTS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, District Judge. (CA-95-698)

Submitted: December 19, 1996

Decided: January 3, 1997

Before ERVIN and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Robert Betts, Appellant Pro Se. Katherine P. Baldwin, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C.S. § 2254 (Law. Co-op. Advance Sheet, June 1996) and denying his motion for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Appellant also appeals the district court's denial of his request to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal and his motion for the appointment of counsel on appeal. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals on the reasoning of the district court. Betts v. Angelone, No. CA-95-698 (E.D. Va. Mar. 14, 1996; Apr. 10, 1996; and July 30, 1996). 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.

DISMISSED