

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 01-4167**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JULIAN PEREZ-CARRILLO, a/k/a Julian Valazquez,  
a/k/a Julian Rivera-Camero, a/k/a Arturo  
Camacho-Camero,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, District  
Judge. (CR-00-188)

---

Submitted: September 20, 2001

Decided: October 9, 2001

---

Before WILLIAMS, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

D. Thomas Lambeth, Jr., HEMRIC, LAMBETH, CHAMPION, & MOSELEY, P.A.,  
Burlington, North Carolina, for Appellant. Benjamin H. White, Jr.,  
United States Attorney, Steven H. Levin, Assistant United States  
Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Julian Perez-Carrillo appeals from the district court's order sentencing him to a 158 month term of imprisonment upon his conviction for conspiracy to distribute marijuana, 21 U.S.C. § 846 (1994), and possession with intent to distribute marijuana, 21 U.S.C.A. § 841 (West 1999). Perez-Carrillo contends on appeal that his sentence was improperly enhanced for his role as a manager or supervisor, pursuant to U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 3B1.1(b) (2000). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. The evidence before the court made clear that the crime involved five or more people. Further, Perez-Carrillo hired several men to unload marijuana from a truck and directed their actions, paid those men from his share of the proceeds, and rented a storage facility for a shipment of marijuana. In light of these facts, we have no difficulty concluding that the enhancement was properly applied. USSG § 3B1.1(b), comment. (n.2); see United States v. Perkins, 108 F.3d 512, 518 (4th Cir. 1997). Accordingly, we affirm Perez-Carrillo'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