

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-6776**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

STEPHEN TRENT TUCKER, a/k/a Stephen Jacobs,  
a/k/a Aviator344, a/k/a STTuckr, a/k/a  
Strent1, a/k/a SPORT,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-  
trict of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Chief District  
Judge. (CR-98-444-A, CA-99-1736-AM)

---

Submitted: October 26, 2000

Decided: November 2, 2000

---

Before WIDENER, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stephen Trent Tucker, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Edward Rich, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Stephen Trent Tucker seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2000). 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. Tucker, Nos. CR-98-444-A; CA-99-1736-AM (E.D. Va. Apr. 28, 2000).\* To the extent Tucker seeks to raise on appeal issues not first presented to the district court for consideration, we decline to review those issues. 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 April 26, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on April 28, 2000. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that 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).