

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>Plaintiff-Appellee,</i>	ü	
v.	ý	No. 99-4450
DAVID TYRONE HALL, a/k/a David Reed, <i>Defendant-Appellant.</i>	þ	

---

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>Plaintiff-Appellee,</i>	ü	
v.	ý	No. 99-4659
HASSEN EMANUEL REEVES, <i>Defendant-Appellant.</i>	þ	

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  
Catherine C. Blake, District Judge.  
(CR-98-192-CCB)

Submitted: May 31, 2000

Decided: October 19, 2000

Before MOTZ and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and  
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed in part and vacated and remanded in part by unpublished  
per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Gerald C. Ruter, THE LAW OFFICES OF GERALD C. RUTER, P.C., Baltimore, Maryland; Joseph B. Tetrault, WRIGHT & MEEHAN, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellants. Lynne A. Battaglia, United States Attorney, John F. Purcell, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

**OPINION****PER CURIAM:**

David Tyrone Hall and Hassen Emanuel Reeves were tried together for their participation in a multicount drug conspiracy and related crimes. Hall and Reeves were tried together and both were convicted of numerous counts. On appeal, their cases have been consolidated. For the reasons that follow, we affirm in part and vacate and remand in part.

Hall and Reeves were convicted of Count 1, conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute cocaine, cocaine base and heroin. Because the jury returned a general form as to the multidrug conspiracy, the defendants cannot be sentenced for more than the statutory maximum for the least-serious single drug conspiracy. *See United States v. Rhynes*, 206 F.3d 349, 379-80 (4th Cir. 1999), *petition for cert. filed*, No. 99-9386 (May 2, 2000). This Court decided *Rhynes* after Appellants were sentenced, and thus, the district court did not have the benefit of our opinion. Accordingly, we vacate the Appellants' sentences for Count 1 and remand for the district court to calculate their sentences in accordance with our decision in *Rhynes*.

Appellants raise numerous other claims on appeal, including claims raised in Hall's pro se informal brief. Although we grant Hall's

---

motion to file his supplemental pro se brief, we find no other reversible error. We also deny Hall's motion for an extension of time to file a reply to the Government's response to his pro se informal brief. Accordingly, we affirm the Appellants' convictions and other sentences. 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 IN PART AND VACATED  
AND REMANDED IN PART*