

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 99-4167

MICHAEL HAMMOND,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.  
Claude M. Hilton, Chief District Judge.  
(CR-98-389-A)

Submitted: July 20, 1999

Decided: September 24, 1999

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Gregory B. English, ENGLISH & SMITH, Alexandria, Virginia, for  
Appellant. Helen F. Fahey, United States Attorney, James G. Duncan,  
Special Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

Michael Hammond appeals from an eighteen-month sentence imposed following his jury convictions for assault by striking, beating, or wounding, 18 U.S.C.A. § 113(a)(4) (West Supp. 1999), and prisoner possession of a shank, 18 U.S.C.A. § 13 (West Supp. 1999) (assimilating Virginia Code Ann. § 53.1-203(4) (Michie 1998)). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error.

Hammond first argues on appeal that the district court erred by denying his motion in limine. We find that Hammond invited the alleged error when he testified on direct examination and introduced the evidence which he sought to exclude by filing the motion in limine. This Court has long held that an appeal may not lie from an error which the defendant himself has caused. See United States v. Jackson, 124 F.3d 607, 615-16 (4th Cir. 1997).

We further find that the district court did not abuse its discretion in excluding the evidence of Corporal Williams' prior reprimand and that, even assuming the decision was in error, such error constituted harmless error. See Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402; see also United States v. Brooks, 111 F.3d 365, 371 (4th Cir. 1997). Accordingly, we affirm Hammond's convictions and sentence. 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