

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 99-4880

PAUL DAVID HOUSE,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh.
James C. Fox, District Judge.
(CR-96-174-BR)

Submitted: May 11, 2000

Decided: May 19, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Edwin C. Walker, Acting Federal Public Defender, Stephen C. Gordon, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellant. Janice McKenzie Cole, United States Attorney, Anne M. Hayes, Assistant United States Attorney, Thomas B. Murphy, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Paul David House appeals the district court's revocation of his supervised release term and probation sentence, and its consecutive sentences based on House's admitted violations of the conditions of his supervised release and probation. House raises three issues on appeal: (1) the district court erred in imposing consecutive sentences; (2) the district judge failed to comply with the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3584(b); and (3) the district court violated 18 U.S.C. § 3553(c), by failing to state its reasons for the sentence imposed. Because House failed to object to the sentence or the manner in which it was imposed, we review his claims for plain error. See United States v. Olano, 507 U.S. 725, 731 (1993).

Our review of the record reveals that the district court made findings of fact regarding each violation of supervised release and probation, and that it considered the applicable guidelines provisions,* as well as House's recidivist tendencies in imposing sentence. Accordingly, we find that the district court was well within its discretion to impose consecutive sentences on House's violations of his terms of supervised release and probation, see United States v. Johnson, 138 F.3d 115, 119 (4th Cir. 1998), and further find that there was no plain error in the district court's compliance with the applicable statutory provisions. See id.; United States v. Davis, 53 F.3d 638, 642 (4th Cir. 1995). 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

*See Chapter 7 of the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines.