

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-4671**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RICKY JOE FRASHURE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern  
District of West Virginia, at Clarksburg. Irene M. Keeley,  
District Judge. (1:10-cr-00091-IMK-JSK-1)

---

Submitted: December 6, 2011

Decided: April 24, 2012

---

Before DUNCAN, DAVIS, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

L. Richard Walker, FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER OFFICE, Clarksburg,  
West Virginia, for Appellant. William J. Ihlenfeld, II, United  
States Attorney, Zelda E. Wesley, Assistant United States  
Attorney, Clarksburg, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ricky Joe Frashure pled guilty to being a felon in possession of a firearm, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2006). He argues on appeal that the district court imposed improper conditions of supervised release. Finding no error, we affirm.

The eight contested conditions of supervised release include psycho-sexual evaluations, psychological testing, possible sex-offender treatment, restrictions on future employment, and other restrictions on Frashure's contact with minor children. Because "district courts have broad latitude to impose conditions on supervised release," this court reviews such conditions only for abuse of discretion. United States v. Armel, 585 F.3d 182, 186 (4th Cir. 2009). The district court may impose any condition that is reasonably related to the relevant statutory sentencing factors, including the nature and circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need to provide adequate deterrence, the need to protect the public, and the need to provide the defendant with training, medical care, or treatment. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a); Armel, 585 F.3d at 186.

After a complete review of the record in this case and meaningful consideration of our recent decision in United States v. Rogers, 2012 WL 698890 (4th Cir. Mar. 6, 2012)

(unpublished), we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing the challenged conditions of supervised release. 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