

**ON PETITION FOR REHEARING**

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

**No. 11-2244**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLES E. LOUTHER, JR.,

Claimant - Appellant,

and

CURRENCY, \$41,939.00 IN U.S.; 2001 ACURA CL, VIN  
19UYA42611A022790,

Defendants,

SHAKITA LOUTHER; CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE, INC.,

Claimants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley,  
Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:09-cv-00164-NCT-PTS)

Submitted: August 21, 2012

Decided: August 27, 2012

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles E. Louthier, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Lynne P. Klauer,  
Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles E. Louthier, Jr., appeals the district court's orders granting the United States' motion to strike his answer and claim to seized money for lack of standing and denying leave to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") on appeal. We initially affirmed the district court's denial of IFP status and dismissed Louthier's appeal of the court's order granting the motion to strike for lack of jurisdiction. We now grant Louthier's petition for rehearing.

We confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Louthier's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's denial of IFP status, we affirm the court's order. Turning to the district court's order granting the United States' motion to strike, we have reviewed the order and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. United States v. Currency, \$41,939.00 in U.S., No. 1:09-cv-00164-NCT-PTS (M.D.N.C. Sept. 6, 2011).

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