

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-4248

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ROHAN ALEXANDER WALTERS, a/k/a Rohan Williams,
a/k/a Dave,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. Charles H. Haden II, Chief District Judge. (CR-97-157)

Submitted: May 18, 1999

Decided: September 14, 1999

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Laishley, Huntington, West Virginia, for Appellant. Rebecca A. Betts, United States Attorney, John C. Parr, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Rohan Walters appeals from a 405-month sentence imposed following his convictions for conspiracy to possess with the intent to distribute and to distribute marijuana, 21 U.S.C.A. § 846 (West Supp. 1998), possession with the intent to distribute marijuana, 21 U.S.C.A. § 841(a)(1) (West 1981), conspiracy to launder money instruments, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1956(a) and (h) (West Supp. 1999), conducting a financial transaction to promote a specified unlawful activity, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1956(a)(1)(A)(i) (West Supp. 1999), conducting a financial transaction to conceal the proceeds of a specified unlawful activity, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i) (West Supp. 1999), and making a false statement in an application for a passport, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1542 (West Supp. 1999). Walters challenges the district court's denial of his motions for judgment of acquittal. In support of his assertions of error, Walters attacks the credibility of an FBI agent and contends that the government failed to link him to the wire transfers that formed the basis of the money laundering charges. Because we conclude that his convictions were supported by sufficient evidence, we find no reversible error and affirm Walters' 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