UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-4717

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

TYSON JEVON LASALLE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (5:00-cr-00032)

Submitted: March 29, 2007 Decided: April 3, 2007

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Roderick G. Davis, LAW OFFICE OF RODERICK G. DAVIS, PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellant. Gretchen C.F. Shappert, United States Attorney, Thomas Cullen, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tyson Jevon LaSalle appeals from the district court's order revoking his supervised release and sentencing him to thirteen months imprisonment after he admitted to a violation of his supervised release. Finding no reversible error, we affirm the revocation order and the sentence imposed.

LaSalle contends that his sentence is unreasonable. We note that the sentence was within the advisory guideline range of seven to thirteen months, see U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 7B1.4(a) (2000), and it was within the applicable statutory maximum of five years. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3) (2000). Additionally, before imposing sentence, the court heard the parties' arguments concerning the application of the permissible 18 U.S.C.A. § 3553(a) (West 2000 & Supp. 2006) factors. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3). We conclude that LaSalle's thirteen-month sentence was not plainly unreasonable. See United States v. Crudup, 461 F.3d 433, 439-40 (4th Cir. 2006), petition for cert. filed (Nov. 3, 2006) (No. 06-7631); United States v. Moreland, 437 F.3d 424, 433 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 2054 (2006).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order revoking LaSalle's supervised release and imposing a thirteen-month 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