

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-4778**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANDRE AMON THOMPSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Chief District Judge. (CR-02-125)

---

Submitted: February 20, 2003

Decided: March 12, 2003

---

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis C. Allen III, Federal Public Defender, John A. Dusenbury, Jr., Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Clifton T. Barrett, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Andre Amon Thompson pled guilty to possession of counterfeit Federal Reserve Notes, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 472 (2000). He was sentenced to twelve months imprisonment. His sole argument on appeal is that the district court erred, during sentencing, in imposing a four-level adjustment under U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 2B5.1(b)(4) (2001), for possession of a firearm in connection with the felony offense. We affirm.

To the extent that Thompson's assertion of error involves a challenge to the district court's interpretation of USSG § 2B5.1, we apply a de novo standard of review. United States v. Daughtrey, 874 F.2d 213, 217 (4th Cir. 1989). To the extent that Thompson's assertion of error challenges the district court's factual findings, we apply the clearly erroneous standard of review. Id.

After reviewing the parties' briefs and the materials submitted on appeal, we find that, under the facts of this case, the district court did not err in applying the enhancement under USSG § 2B5.1(b)(4). Accordingly, we affirm Thompson'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