UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-8562

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISAAC LEE WOODS; REGINA BAILEY WOODS,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 09-6271

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISAAC LEE WOODS; REGINA BAILEY WOODS,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 09-6671

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISAAC LEE WOODS; REGINA BAILEY WOODS,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 09-6953

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISAAC LEE WOODS; REGINA BAILEY WOODS,

Defendants - Appellants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Louise W. Flanagan, Chief District Judge. (5:05-cr-00131-FL-1)

Submitted: July 23, 2009 Decided: August 14, 2009

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Isaac Lee Woods; Regina Bailey Woods, Appellants Pro Se. Sarah Burnette, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Isaac Lee Woods and Regina Bailey Woods appeal three district court orders and one magistrate judge's order. After their four-day trial and this court's affirmance of their convictions and sentences, the Woods began to file numerous meritless post-judgment motions in the district court challenging various parts of the trial, their convictions, sentences and orders of restitution. We have reviewed the district court orders that are the subject of appeal nos. 08-8562, 09-6671 and 09-6953 and affirm for the reasons cited by the district court in its orders. We echo the court's direction to the Woods that if they want to challenge their convictions and sentences, they should use the procedures outlined under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009). With respect to the Woods' appeal in no. 09-6271 from the magistrate judge's order denying motions to compel and to supplement that motion, we are without jurisdiction because the order was non-appealable. See Rataratnam v. Moyer, 47 F.3d 922, 924 (7th Cir. 1995); see also Estate of Conners v. O'Conner, 6 F.3d 656, 659 (9th Cir. 1993).

Accordingly, we affirm in part and dismiss in part. We grant the Woods' motion to proceed in forma pauperis. We also deny as moot their motions to expedite the appeals, for bail or release pending appeal and to reconsider the order

denying their motion to unseal the record. 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;
DISMISSED IN PART