

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

HAROLD RAY DRAUGHON, JR.,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 01-4446

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh.  
W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge.  
(CR-96-160)

Submitted: November 20, 2001

Decided: December 6, 2001

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Thomas P. McNamara, Federal Public Defender, Stephen C. Gordon,  
Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for  
Appellant. John Stuart Bruce, United States Attorney, Anne M.  
Hayes, Yvonne V. Watford-McKinney, Assistant United States Attor-  
neys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

### OPINION

#### PER CURIAM:

Harold Ray Draughon, Jr., appeals his eleven-month sentence imposed after the district court revoked his term of supervised release. Draughon alleges that the district court erred by failing to make adequate findings to support its decision that he violated the terms of his release. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

Because Draughon did not object to the district court's findings at the revocation hearing, we review his claim for plain error and find none. *United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725, 732-33 (1993). Draughon was charged with four violations of the terms of his supervised release. Draughon unconditionally admitted to two of the violations. Therefore, the district court did not need to make any additional findings as to these violations. Likewise, Draughon admitted to a third violation. Although he offered an explanation in mitigation, which the court stated it considered in determining a sentence, Draughon did not challenge the factual basis for the charge.

Draughon only challenged the charge that he used a controlled substance. Reviewing the district court's order, together with the transcript of the hearing,\* we find that the court adequately stated its reasons for resolving this issue against Draughon.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order revoking Draughon's term of supervised release and sentencing him to eleven months imprisonment. 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 generally *United States v. Copley*, 978 F.2d 829, 832 (4th Cir. 1992) (affirming the revocation of supervised release based on an analysis of the record as a whole).