

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-1149

JOHN C. WELLS; JAMES A. GAIN; SHAYNE M.
NICHOLS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, President of the United States; NEWT GINGRICH, Speaker of the House; LAUCH FAIRCLOTH; SUE MYRICK, U.S. House of Representatives; JANET RENO, U.S. Attorney General; CABLE NEWS NETWORK; RICHARD MARSH, Internal Revenue Service; NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, INCORPORATED; ORRIN HATCH; JESSE HELMS, U.S. Senator; D.K. SCOTT, NC Department of Revenue; THAD CABLE; USA TODAY NEWSPAPER; MARGARET M. RICHARDSON; CAPITAL BROADCASTING COMPANY, INCORPORATED; JAMES B. HUNT, JR., Governor; MIKE EASLEY, Attorney General of NC; BOB DOLE; AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY, INCORPORATED; GEORGE W. BOYLAN; B.W. THOMAS; JANICE H. FALKNER; J.R. STARKEY; ROSS PEROT; RUSH LIMBAUGH; THE SPOTLIGHT NEWSPAPER; JAMES SULLIVAN; CHRISTIAN BROADCASTING NETWORK, INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert D. Potter, Senior District Judge. (CA-96-428-3-P)

Submitted: June 19, 1997

Decided: June 26, 1997

Before WILKINS and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER,* Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John C. Wells, James A. Gain, Shayne M. Nichols, Appellants Pro Se. Steven Wesley Parks, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C.; Jonathan E. Buchan, Stephen David Allred, SMITH, HELMS, MULLISS & MOORE, Charlotte, North Carolina; David Neil Ventker, HUFF, POOLE & MAHONEY, P.C., Virginia Beach, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

* Senior Judge Butzner did not participate in consideration of this case. The opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal the district court's order dismissing their civil action alleging that the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution is unlawful. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Wells v. Clinton, No. CA-96-428-3-P (E.D.N.C. Nov. 18, 1996). 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