

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

ZAUBRALINDA Z. FAISON, a/k/a Linda  
Faison, a/k/a Zaubralind Little, a/k/a  
Nee Little, a/k/a Zaubra Faison,  
a/k/a Zaubralinda Zelda Little,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 00-4371

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh.  
W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge.  
(CR-99-145-BR)

Submitted: February 16, 2001

Decided: March 26, 2001

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Theodore Mark Cooperstein, THEODORE M. COOPERSTEIN, P.C.,  
Washington, D.C., for Appellant. Janice McKenzie Cole, United  
States Attorney, Anne M. Hayes, Assistant United States Attorney,  
Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

---

### OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Zaubralinda Faison appeals from her conviction following her guilty plea to embezzlement of public money, 18 U.S.C. § 641 (1994), and conspiracy to defraud the United States government, 18 U.S.C. § 371 (1994), for which she was sentenced to concurrent terms of eighteen months imprisonment. Faison claims that the district court abused its discretion in denying her motions to withdraw her guilty plea and for substitution of counsel.

This court reviews the denial of a motion to withdraw a guilty plea for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Craig*, 985 F.2d 175, 178 (4th Cir. 1993). Based on the factors set out in *United States v. Moore*, 931 F.2d 245, 248 (4th Cir. 1991), we find that the court did not abuse its discretion in denying that motion.

This court also reviews the denial of a motion for substitution of counsel for abuse of discretion. *United States v. DeTemple*, 162 F.3d 279, 288 (4th Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, 526 U.S. 1137 (1999). Our review of the record discloses no abuse of discretion by the district court in denying Faison's motion for substitution of her court-appointed attorney with privately-retained counsel. *See United States v. Mullen*, 32 F.3d 891, 895 (4th Cir. 1994) (setting forth the factors for review of motions for the appointment of substitute counsel). Accordingly, we affirm Faison's conviction and sentence. 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*