

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-1700**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

OLUDARE OGUNDE,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

ONE 1989 FORD ECONOLINE VAN, VIN:  
1FT3E34X3KHA20562; ONE 1992 HONDA ACCORD, VIN:  
1HGCB7143NA033977; VARIOUS ITEMS OF ELECTRONIC  
EQUIPMENT AND JEWELRY DESCRIBED IN ATTACHMENT  
"A"; \$6450 IN TRAVELERS CHECKS, MONEY ORDERS  
AND UNITED STATES CURRENCY IN THE AMOUNT OF  
\$5,100; ONE 1983 JAGUAR, VIN:  
SAJAV134XDC363714,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Chief  
District Judge. (CA-97-1382-A)

---

Submitted: December 8, 1998

Decided: December 30, 1998

---

Before MURNAGHAN and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges, and HALL, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Oludare Ogunde, Appellant Pro Se. Gordon Dean Kromberg, OFFICE OF  
THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Oludare Ogunde appeals the district court's orders granting the Government's motion for summary judgment on count three of its complaint for forfeiture and civil penalties, denying Appellant's motions to hold the motion for summary judgment in abeyance and for return of property, and ordering forfeiture. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. United States v. Ogunde, No. CA-97-1382-A (E.D. Va. Apr. 3\* & 29, 1998). We deny Appellant's motions for summary disposition and appointment of counsel. 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 the district court's judgment or order is marked as "filed" on April 2, 1998, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on April 3, 1998. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the judgment or order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).