

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 26 2015

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

CHARLES M. WOOLSEY,  
  
Plaintiff - Appellant,  
  
v.  
  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Defendant - Appellee.

No. 14-16384

D.C. No. 4:14-cv-01933-RCC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Raner C. Collins, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 22, 2015\*\*

Before: HAWKINS, GRABER, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Charles M. Woolsey appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his petition for a writ of error coram nobis. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.

§ 1291. We review the denial of a coram nobis petition de novo, *see United States v. Riedl*, 496 F.3d 1003, 1005 (9th Cir. 2007), and we affirm.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)*.

Woolsey challenges his 1974 guilty-plea conviction for possession with intent to distribute marijuana on the ground that counsel was constitutionally ineffective. Because Woolsey has shown no valid reason for failing to attack his conviction earlier or an error “of the most fundamental character,” he is not entitled to a writ of error coram nobis, and the district court properly denied relief. *See id.* at 1005-06.

**AFFIRMED.**