

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

FREDERICK BERNARD WILLIAMS,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 01-4232

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk.  
Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge.  
(CR-00-137)

Submitted: August 9, 2001

Decided: August 20, 2001

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Duncan R. St. Clair, III, DUNCAN R. ST. CLAIR, III & ASSO-  
CIATES, P.C., Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellant. Kenneth E. Melson,  
United States Attorney, James Ashford Metcalfe, Assistant United  
States Attorney, C. Seth Askins, Third Year Law Student, Norfolk,  
Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

### OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Frederick Bernard Williams appeals his conviction for possession with intent to distribute marijuana, contending that the evidence was insufficient to support his conviction. In reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence, the relevant question is not whether the court is convinced of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, but rather whether the evidence, when viewed in the light most favorable to the Government, was sufficient for a rational trier of fact to have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. *United States v. Burgos*, 94 F.3d 849, 862-63 (4th Cir. 1996) (en banc). At the bench trial, Detective Hartig testified that Williams admitted that marijuana packaged for sale and found in Williams' bag at Williams' workplace was his and that he sold it. Williams also admitted that he was aware of the presence of another quantity of marijuana located in a trashcan near his workstation. While Williams denied making these statements, the trial court clearly chose to believe Detective Hartig, and we will not review the trial court's credibility determinations. *Mazzell v. Evatt*, 88 F.3d 263, 270-71 (4th Cir. 1996). Thus, we affirm Williams' conviction. 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*