

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-4441**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MARTIN E. WILLIAMS, a/k/a Martin Hudson  
Williams,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior  
District Judge. (CR-02-450)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2004

Decided: February 13, 2004

---

Before WILLIAMS, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher F. Cowan, COWAN & OWEN, P.C., Richmond, Virginia, for  
Appellant. Paul J. McNulty, United States Attorney, Michael C.  
Wallace, Sr., Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Martin E. Williams appeals his conviction following a bench trial of one count of conspiracy to distribute 500 or more grams of cocaine in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2000). Williams's sole claim on appeal is that the evidence presented at trial was insufficient to support his conviction.

In reviewing a sufficiency of the evidence claim, a guilty verdict "must be sustained if there is substantial evidence, taking the view most favorable to the government, to support the finding of guilt." Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942); United States v. Burgos, 94 F.3d 849, 862 (4th Cir. 1996) (en banc). In resolving issues of substantial evidence, this Court does not weigh evidence or review witness credibility. United States v. Romer, 148 F.3d 359, 364 (4th Cir. 1998).

We find the evidence, when viewed in its entirety and in the light most favorable to the government, is sufficient to support Williams's conspiracy conviction. Accordingly, we affirm. We deny Williams leave to file a pro se supplemental brief. 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