

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-4138

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

EDWARD VASHON BRYANT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. C. Weston Houck, Senior District Judge. (CR-02-47)

Submitted: January 15, 2004

Decided: February 2, 2004

Before WIDENER and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William F. Nettles, IV, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellant. J. Strom Thurmond, Jr., United States Attorney, Rose Mary Parham, Assistant United States Attorney, Thomas E. Booth, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Edward Vashon Bryant appeals his jury conviction for being a felon in possession of a firearm, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (2000). He was sentenced to ten years in prison.

On appeal, Bryant argues that there was insufficient evidence that the firearm he possessed had traveled in interstate commerce. In reviewing a sufficiency challenge, "[t]he verdict of a jury must be sustained if there is substantial evidence, taking the view most favorable to the Government, to support it." Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942). "Substantial evidence," in the context of a criminal action, is that evidence a reasonable finder of fact could accept as adequate and sufficient to support a conclusion of a defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. See United States v. Newsome, 322 F.3d 328, 333 (4th Cir. 2003). A defendant challenging the sufficiency of evidence to support his conviction "bears a heavy burden." United States v. Beidler, 110 F.3d 1064, 1067 (4th Cir. 1997).

We conclude that, when viewed in the light most favorable to the Government, there was sufficient evidence presented at trial to establish the firearm traveled in interstate commerce. We therefore affirm Bryant's conviction and sentence. Bryant's motion to file a supplemental brief is denied. 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 in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED