UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Plaintiff-Appellee,* v. CHANTEZ TYRELL DICKERSON, *Defendant-Appellant.*	No. 00-4486

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk.
Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge.
(CR-00-16)

Submitted: March 9, 2001

Decided: March 26, 2001

Before LUTTIG, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

William P. Robinson, Jr., ROBINSON, NEELEY & ANDERSON, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellant. Helen F. Fahey, United States Attorney, James Ashford Metcalfe, Assistant United States Attorney, Ali T. Sprinkle, Third Year Law Student, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Chantez Tyrell Dickerson appeals his conviction for possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (West Supp. 2000). We affirm.

Dickerson contends the evidence was insufficient to sustain his §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) conviction. When reviewing a claim of insufficiency of the evidence, "we must determine whether there is substantial evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to the Government, to support the verdict." *United States v. Hastings*, 134 F.3d 235, 238 (4th Cir. 1998). "[S]ubstantial evidence is evidence that a reasonable finder of fact could accept as adequate and sufficient to support a conclusion of a defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt." *United States v. Burgos*, 94 F.3d 849, 862 (4th Cir. 1996) (en banc). When evaluating the sufficiency of the evidence, we do not review the credibility of the witnesses nor resolve any conflicts in the evidence presented at trial. *Id.*

We have reviewed the record and briefs and find sufficient evidence to support Dickerson's conviction. Accordingly, we affirm. 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