

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 00-3024

September Term, 2000

99cr00102-01

Filed On: September 20, 2000^[544653]

United States of America,
Appellee

v.

Tina M. Pringle,
Appellant

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BEFORE: Ginsburg, Sentelle, and Henderson, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the briefs filed by the parties. The court has determined that the issues presented occasion no need for an opinion. See Fed. R. App. P. 36; D.C. Cir. Rule 36(b). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that appellant's conviction and the district court's denial of appellant's motion for new trial, see Fed. Crim. R. 33, be affirmed substantially for the reasons stated by the district court in its memorandum order filed on January 27, 2000. The district court did not abuse its discretion in excluding the evidence of third party culpability and denying appellant's motion for new trial based on error attributed to that evidentiary ruling. See United States v. Wilson, 160 F.3d 732, 742 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (court applies deferential, abuse-of-discretion standard in reviewing district court's exclusion of evidence), cert. denied, 120 S. Ct. 81 (1999); United States v. Lafayette, 983 F.2d 1102, 1105 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (court reviews denial of motion for new trial for abuse of discretion).

The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after disposition of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam