

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

ZEDRICK HENSON,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 01-4999

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

ROBERT MCCORMICK, JR.,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 01-5000

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

NIGEL D. MARINE,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 01-5001

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Catherine C. Blake, District Judge.
(CR-01-77-CCB)

Submitted: July 19, 2002

Decided: August 2, 2002

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Kenneth W. Ravenell, SCHULMAN, TREEM, KAMINKOW & GILDEN, P.A., Baltimore, Maryland; Paul M. Polansky, THE LAW OFFICES OF PAUL M. POLANSKY, Baltimore, Maryland; Joseph Murtha, IRWIN, GREEN, DEXTER & MURTHA, L.L.P., Towson, Maryland, for Appellants. Thomas M. DiBiagio, United States Attorney, A. David Copperthite, Assistant United States Attorney, Paul M. Tiao, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

The Appellants, Zedrick Henson, Robert McCormick, Jr., and Nigel Marine, challenge their convictions and sentences, pursuant to their guilty pleas, to aiding and abetting, and possession with intent to distribute in excess of 500 grams or more of cocaine base, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2 (1994), 21 U.S.C.A. § 841(a)(1) (West 1999 & Supp. 2002). Henson was sentenced to 235 months incarceration and four years supervised release. McCormick was sentenced to 168 months incarceration and four years supervised release. Marine was sentenced to 70 months incarceration and four years supervised release.

On appeal, the Appellants argue the district court erred in denying their motions to suppress evidence obtained from a search of a residence in Baltimore, Maryland. We review a district court's legal conclusions on a suppression motion de novo, and the court's underlying

factual determinations for clear error. *United States v. Seidman*, 156 F.3d 542, 547 (4th Cir. 1998). The Appellants' challenge is meritless; the district court did not err in concluding the search warrant application, viewed under the appropriate standard, established probable cause to issue a search warrant for the residence. *Murray v. United States*, 487 U.S. 533, 542 (1988); *United States v. Walton*, 56 F.3d 551, 554-56 (4th Cir. 1995).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's denial of the Appellants' suppression motions, and we affirm the Appellants' convictions and sentences. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not significantly aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED