

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-4959**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEVON RAYNARD NICHOLSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas David Schroeder, District Judge. (1:09-cr-00200-TDS-1)

---

Submitted: May 19, 2011

Decided: May 23, 2011

---

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

A. Wayne Harrison, Sr., LAW OFFICES OF A. WAYNE HARRISON, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Ripley Rand, United States Attorney, Randall S. Galyon, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jevon Raynard Nicholson appeals his conviction and 210-month sentence after entering a conditional guilty plea to one count of possession with intent to distribute cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C.A. §§ 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(B) (West 1999 & Supp. 2010). Nicholson asserts that the district court erred when it denied his motions to suppress the fruits of a police search on his vehicle. Because we disagree, we affirm the district court's judgment.

In reviewing the district court's denial of Nicholson's suppression motions, we review the district court's factual determinations for clear error and any legal determinations de novo. United States v. Kelly, 592 F.3d 586, 589 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 130 S. Ct. 3374 (2010). Because the district court denied Nicholson's motions, we construe the evidence "in the light most favorable to the government." Id. We have reviewed the transcript of the suppression hearing and have considered the parties' arguments and discern no error in the district court's denial of Nicholson's suppression motions.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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