

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

GEORGE MCBRIDE, a/k/a Benzo,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 01-4664

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville.  
Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge.  
(CR-00-69)

Submitted: July 29, 2002

Decided: August 7, 2002

Before WILLIAMS and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and  
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

D. Garrison Hill, HILL & HILL, L.L.C., Greenville, South Carolina,  
for Appellant. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., United States Attorney, Thomas  
R. Ascik, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Caro-  
lina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

### OPINION

PER CURIAM:

George McBride appeals his conviction and life sentence for conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute at least five kilograms of cocaine, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 846 (2000). We affirm.

McBride contends the district court improperly sentenced him as a career offender. We review the district court's decision to apply the career offender guideline de novo. *United States v. Williams*, 29 F.3d 172, 173 (4th Cir. 1994). A defendant is a career offender if: (1) he is at least eighteen years old when the instant offense was committed; (2) the instant offense is a felony and is either a crime of violence or a drug offense; and (3) he has at least two prior felony convictions for crimes of violence or drug offenses. *U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual* § 4B1.1 (1998). The district court properly determined McBride has two prior felony convictions for crimes of violence. *See* USSG § 4B1.2, comment (n.1). Therefore, we find McBride was properly sentenced as a career offender.

Accordingly, we affirm McBride's conviction and sentence. We deny McBride's motion to file an informal supplemental brief.\* 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*

---

\*We note that the issue McBride seeks to assert under *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), is meritless.