

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-5046**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JUSTICE ALLAH ROBINSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., District Judge. (1:06-cr-00085-NCT)

---

Submitted: May 10, 2007

Decided: May 14, 2007

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

A. Wayne Harrison, Sr., LAW OFFICES OF A. WAYNE HARRISON, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Lisa B. Boggs, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In 2006, Justice Allah Robinson was arrested for participating in a drug sale. Thereafter, Robinson filed a motion to suppress evidence gained from a related search of his residence. The district court denied the motion to suppress, and Robinson entered a conditional guilty plea to possession with intent to distribute cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(b), and possession with intent to distribute cocaine hydrochloride, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(C). The district court then sentenced Robinson to 188 months in prison and five years of supervised release.

Robinson timely appealed, challenging the denial of his motion to suppress. Robinson argued that because a tipster was unreliable, the police improperly stopped and searched Robinson's vehicle. Additionally, Robinson argued that as the stop and search supported the warrant issued to search his residence, the evidence discovered at his residence was inadmissible at trial. After conducting a thorough review of the record, we conclude the district court properly denied the motion to suppress.

Accordingly, we affirm Robinson's convictions and 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