

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7425

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

RUTH VANESSA WALKER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (CR-95-455-AMD, CA-99-1821-AMD)

Submitted: February 10, 2000 Decided: February 15, 2000

Before WIDENER and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ruth Vanessa Walker, Appellant Pro Se. John Francis Purcell, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Ruth Vanessa Walker seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion seeking reconsideration of the district court's dismissal of her motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 1999). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court. See United States v. Walker, Nos. CR-95-455-AMD; CA-99-1821-AMD (D. Md. Jul. 27, 1999).* 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

* Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on July 26, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on July 27, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date the 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).