

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-8004

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISAAC LEE WOODS; REGINA BAILEY WOODS,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 10-6039

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: April 8, 2010

Decided: May 7, 2010

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Isaac Lee Woods, Regina Bailey Woods, Appellants Pro Se. S.
Katherine Burnette, Edward D. Gray, Assistant United States
Attorneys, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 challenge two district court orders disposing of several of their post-judgment motions and their objections to the United States' attempt to collect on the judgment of restitution. We affirm.

We find no error in the United States' decision not to commence a separate civil action in order to enforce the judgment of restitution. We further note there was no clear error by the district court finding that there was nothing to suggest an improper criminal investigation by the United States instead of a legitimate attempt to collect on the judgment of restitution.

We have reviewed the record and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See United States v. Woods, No. 5:05-cr-00131-FL-1 (E.D.N.C. Oct. 23, 2009; Dec. 28, 2009). We also deny the Woods' motion for a copy of a transcript of the October 8, 2009 hearing prepared at the Government's expense and their motion to expedite. 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