

UNPUBLISHED
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

DARCELLOUS SAFRANSKE CARRAWAY,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 02-4212

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

STACEY JOSEPH MILLINER,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 02-4230

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham.
Frank W. Bullock, Jr., District Judge.
(CR-01-89)

Submitted: June 25, 2002

Decided: July 25, 2002

Before LUTTIG, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Thomas N. Cochran, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro,
North Carolina; William L. Osteen, ADAM & OSTEEN, Greensboro,

North Carolina, for Appellants. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Robert M. Hamilton, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Darcellous Safranske Carraway and Stacey Joseph Milliner each pled guilty to bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 2113(a) (West 2000), and were sentenced respectively to prison terms of sixty months and sixty-six months. They contend on appeal that the district court erred by making their sentences consecutive to the undischarged state sentences they were serving without considering factors set out in 18 U.S.C.A. § 3553(a) (West 2000), and the commentary to *U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual* § 5G1.3(c), p.s. (2001). We affirm the sentences.

Carraway and Milliner maintain that the district court erred in not making explicit findings concerning the factors set out in the commentary to § 5G1.3(c). We disagree. We are satisfied from our review of the record that the district court was aware of its sentencing options, of the applicable statutes and guidelines, and was familiar with the facts of this case. The sentencing court is not required to make specific findings as to each of the § 3553(a) factors. *United States v. Johnson*, 138 F.3d 115, 119 (4th Cir. 1998); *United States v. Velasquez*, 136 F.3d 921, 924 (2d Cir. 1998).

We therefore affirm the 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 aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED