

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-4485**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISAAC LEE WOODS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 07-4486**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

REGINA BAILEY WOODS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

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)

---

Submitted: September 24, 2008

Decided: October 8, 2008

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael A. Grace, Christopher R. Clifton, GRACE, TISDALE & CLIFTON, P.A., Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellants. Anne Margaret Hayes, Assistant United States Attorney, Clay Campbell Wheeler, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 their convictions and sentences. The Appellants were convicted of one count of conspiracy to commit identity theft, wire fraud, fake entries and false statements, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371 (2000), thirteen counts of wire fraud and aiding and abetting such fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 1343, 2 (West 2000 & Supp. 2008), eleven counts of false statements on HUD forms, in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 1001, 2 (West 2000 & Supp. 2008), one count of conspiracy to commit money laundering, in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 1956(h) (West 2000 & Supp. 2008), and five counts of money laundering and aiding and abetting such conduct, in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 1956(a)(1)(A)(I), 2 (West 2000 & Supp. 2008). The Woods' counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting there were no meritorious issues for appeal, but suggesting the court review the sufficiency of the evidence. The Woods have filed a pro se supplemental brief. The Government declined to file a brief. Finding no meritorious issues, we affirm.

The Woods were convicted after a four-day jury trial during which the Government established that the Woods, as approved mortgage lenders for the Government National Mortgage Association ("Ginnie Mae") submitted fraudulent mortgage documents using the

names, signatures and social security numbers of friends and relatives for their own enrichment. The evidence further established the Woods laundered some of the funds they received in order to conceal their scheme. In addition, the Woods filed other fraudulent documents with the Government in order to become approved lenders and to conceal their fraudulent conduct. We have reviewed the record and find the evidence was sufficient. We have also considered the issues raised in the Woods' pro se supplemental brief and find the arguments to be without merit.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the Woods' convictions and sentences. We also deny the Woods' pending pro se motions to submit the cases on their informal brief, to relieve their retained appellate counsel, to expedite review, to reconsider their motion for release pending the appeal, and for a new trial based on a deficient record on appeal. This court requires counsel inform their clients, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If either requests a petition be filed, but counsel believes such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the Appellants. 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