

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-4784

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ABDUL HAMEED,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:07-cr-00252-LMB-1)

Submitted: April 7, 2009

Decided: April 28, 2009

Before KING and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Abdul Hameed, Appellant Pro Se. James Philip Gillis, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Abdul Hameed appeals from his convictions for conspiracy, continuing financial criminal enterprise, mail fraud, aggravated identity theft, and fraudulent use of credit cards. Hameed proceeded pro se in the district court, and he is pro se here on appeal. His informal brief contains numerous nonsensical and meritless claims, most challenging the jurisdiction of the district court. We find most of his claims without legal basis and dismiss them as frivolous.

The one claim we will address in further detail is Hameed's assertion that he did not understand the charges against him. On the day of his trial and after a psychiatric examination found him to be competent, Hameed stipulated to all the facts in his case as forecast by the Government and was, thus, found guilty by the court. Hameed had previously dismissed his attorneys in order to proceed pro se. He was appointed stand-by counsel, but he refused to utilize that resource. When the district court attempted to inform Hameed of the rights he was waiving and ascertain whether he understood his options, Hameed declined to respond appropriately and instead repeated that he did not consent to the proceedings and that the court was without jurisdiction. We find, therefore, that, to the extent Hameed did not understand the charges against him, he had only himself to blame. He spurned all help

and advice that was offered and continued to pursue frivolous claims even after they had already been denied on more than one occasion.

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm Hameed's convictions. 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