

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLOTTE DIVISION  
3:07-CV-361-MU  
(3:03-CR-218-MU)

CHRISTOPHER REGINALD HINES, )  
 )  
 Petitioner, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
 )  
 Respondent. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

ORDER

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court upon Petitioner’s “Successive Motion for Bail” filed on October 8, 2008. (Doc. No. 46.)

On August 27, 2007, Petitioner filed a Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 which included claims of prosecutorial misconduct and ineffective assistance of counsel involving two different attorneys as well as claims of actual innocence. On November 13, 2007, Petitioner filed a Motion for Bond Pending 2255 Review. (Doc. No. 9.) On November 15, 2007, this Court denied that motion for failing to meet the high standard governing motions for release pending appeal. (Doc. No. 10.) On November 30, 2007, Petitioner filed a Motion for Reconsideration regarding the Court’s Order denying Petitioner’s Motion for Bond. (Doc. No. 13.) On December 10, 2007, this Court denied Petitioner’s Motion for Reconsideration. (Doc. No. 14.) On January 14, 2008, Petitioner filed a second Motion for Bond based on new evidence. (Doc. No. 25.) This Court denied that Motion for Bond on January 16, 2008, again finding that Petitioner failed to meet the high standard governing

motions for release pending appeal. (Doc. No. 26.) On June 30, 2008, Petitioner filed another Motion for Bond renewing his assertions that his circumstances are “extraordinary” within the meaning of the standard for bond release pending appeal. On July 11, 2008, this Court denied Petitioner’s motion (Doc. No. 45.)

Petitioner has once again requested that this Court release him on bond pending the outcome of his Motion to Vacate. Once again, this Court will deny Petitioner’s motion and relies on the reasoning included in the Court’s previous orders. (Doc. Nos. 10, 14, 26 and 45.)

As this Court has already noted in its four previous Orders denying Petitioner’s Motions for Bond and Reconsideration, Petitioner has not met the appropriate standard required to be granted bond. Petitioner has not set forth any facts or circumstances which warrant a different conclusion than this Court has previously drawn.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that Petitioner’s “Successive Motion for Bail” (Doc. No. 46) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Signed: October 24, 2008



Graham C. Mullen  
United States District Judge

