

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7618

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEMETRIUS A. CRANDLE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Jerome B. Friedman, Senior District Judge. (4:06-cr-00137-JBF-JEB-1; 4:08-cv-00111-JBF)

Submitted: March 9, 2011

Decided: March 21, 2011

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Demetrius A. Crandle, Appellant Pro Se. Scott W. Putney, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Demetrius Crandle appealed from the district court's order denying his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. We granted a certificate of appealability on the issue of whether Crandle's trial counsel was ineffective for failing to file a motion to suppress. We then remanded for an evidentiary hearing and factual and legal findings. The district court held a hearing, made the requested findings, and then returned the case to this court. Neither party has challenged the district court's findings on remand.

We have reviewed the record and the district court's order on remand, and we find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the denial of Crandle's § 2255 motion for the reasons stated by the district court. United States v. Crandle, No. 4:06-cr-00137-JBF-JEB-1 (E.D. Va. filed July 26 & entered July 28, 2010). 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