

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>Plaintiff-Appellee,</i>
v.
GRADY LASSITER, JR., <i>Defendant-Appellant.</i>

No. 02-4275

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk.
Henry C. Morgan, Jr., District Judge.
(CR-01-154)

Submitted: August 16, 2002

Decided: September 3, 2002

Before WIDENER, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Cheryl D. Footman-Banks, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellant. Paul J. McNulty, United States Attorney, Raymond E. Patricco, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Christopher I. Jacobs, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Grady Lassiter, Jr., appeals his conviction and 140 month sentence for possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2000), and possession of marijuana, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 844 (2000). On appeal, Lassiter raises two issues.

First, Lassiter argues the evidence was insufficient to support his convictions. We review a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence to determine whether, taking the evidence in the light most favorable to the Government, any reasonable trier of fact could have found the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942). Lassiter's challenge is meritless. The testimony of the Government's witnesses established Lassiter knowingly possessed a firearm as a convicted felon, and that he knowingly possessed marijuana. 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2000); 21 U.S.C.A. § 844 (2000); *United States v. Beidler*, 110 F.3d 1064, 1067 (4th Cir. 1997).

Second, Lassiter argues the district court erred in admitting evidence obtained from a police search of a car in which Lassiter was a passenger. Lassiter has waived this issue by his failure to file a pre-trial suppression motion in district court. *United States v. Ricco*, 52 F.3d 58, 62 (4th Cir. 1995).

Accordingly, we affirm Lassiter's convictions 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 significantly aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED