

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-7870**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Petitioner - Appellee,

versus

PAUL NAGY,

Respondent - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (5:98-HC-00951-BR)

---

Submitted: July 18, 2007

Decided: August 2, 2007

---

Before WILKINSON and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Paul Nagy, Appellant Pro Se. Michael David Bredenberg, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Paul Nagy appeals the district court's order finding that he continues to satisfy the criteria for commitment set forth at 18 U.S.C. § 4246 (2000) and continuing Nagy's commitment to the custody of the Attorney General. The record reveals that, upon Nagy's motion, the district court conducted a hearing pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 4247(h) (2000). At the hearing, Dr. Corcoran testified that Nagy still suffered from delusional disorder, prosecutory type, and that Nagy was not taking antipsychotic medication because of side effects and Nagy's refusal to take such medication. Dr. Corcoran testified that Nagy's release in the United States was not advisable because his release would create a substantial risk of danger to others or to others' property. Following the hearing, the district court issued an order stating that Nagy continues to suffer from a mental disease or defect as a result of which his release would create a substantial risk of bodily injury to another person or serious damage to property of others. Accordingly, the court ordered Nagy's continued commitment to the custody of the Attorney General.

Based on our review of the record, the district court did not clearly err in its determination. We accordingly affirm the decision of the district court. We deny the motion to expedite and 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