

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*  
v.  
DUAN A. SOMERS,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 01-4209

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.  
T. S. Ellis, III, District Judge.  
(CR-00-360-A)

Submitted: August 3, 2001

Decided: August 28, 2001

Before WIDENER, WILKINS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Thomas C. Carter, CARTER & KRAMER, P.C., Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellant. Kenneth E. Melson, United States Attorney, Morris R. Parker, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

**OPINION**

## PER CURIAM:

A jury convicted Duan Somers for his part in a drug conspiracy. On appeal, Somers alleges that the evidence was insufficient to sustain the finding of guilt. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

On direct appeal of a criminal conviction, a "verdict must be sustained if there is substantial evidence, taking the view most favorable to the Government, to support it." *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942). In the present case, the testimony at trial showed that Somers supplied numerous people with significant amounts of crack cocaine over a period of almost six years.

The majority of the evidence against Somers came from the testimony of co-conspirators. Somers' sole argument on appeal is that this testimony was incredible because the witnesses were convicted drug users seeking reductions in their sentences. We do not review the credibility of the witnesses, and we assume that the jury resolved all contradictions in the testimony and the evidence in favor of the Government. *United States v. Romer*, 148 F.3d 359, 364 (4th Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, 525 U.S. 1141 (1999). The record here shows that the witnesses disclosed their desires for reductions in their sentences, but the jury nevertheless chose to credit their testimony.

Because we find that there was substantial evidence to support the jury's verdict, we affirm Somers' 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*