

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

KARLTON EMMANUEL HAMMOND,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 02-4483

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham.
Frank W. Bullock, Jr., District Judge.
(CR-01-306)

Submitted: October 16, 2002

Decided: October 25, 2002

Before WIDENER, WILLIAMS, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Louis C. Allen, III, Federal Public Defender, Eric D. Placke, Assistant
Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant.
Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Michael F. Joseph,
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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Karlon Emmanuel Hammond pled guilty to one count of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon. The district court sentenced him to a term of 270 months imprisonment. Hammond appeals his sentence, contending that the district court erred in finding that he possessed a firearm in connection with a crime of violence pursuant to USSG § 4B1.4(b)(3)(A). *U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual* § 4B1.4(b)(3)(A) (2001). Hammond specifically insists that the evidence presented at sentencing was insufficient to support a finding that he in fact committed a crime of violence.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record and conclude that the district court's finding that Hammond committed felony assault with a deadly weapon on a government official was not clearly erroneous. *United States v. Blake*, 81 F.3d 498, 503 (4th Cir. 1996). Likewise, we reject Hammond's claim that the district court erred in declining to award him a three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility. See *United States v. Holt*, 79 F.3d 14, 17 (4th Cir. 1996); *United States v. Falesbork*, 5 F.3d 715, 721-22 (4th Cir. 1993).

We accordingly affirm Hammond's 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