

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7481

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

LINWOOD GRAY,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 99-7482

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

DARRELL BRACEY,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 99-7483

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

RONALD M. HUMPHRIES,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge. (CR-94-241-DKC, CA-97-4287-DKC, CA-97-4288-DKC)

Submitted: April 28, 2000

Decided: September 18, 2000

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeffrey Daniel Zimmerman, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellants.
Barbara Suzanne Skalla, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants seek to appeal the district court's order denying their 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. Gray; United States v. Bracey; United States v. Humphries, Nos. CR-94-241-DKC; CA-97-4287-DKC; CA-97-4288-DKC (D. Md. Sept. 9, 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 judgment or order is marked as "filed" on September 8, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on September 9, 1999. 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).