

UNPUBLISHED
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>Plaintiff-Appellee,</i> v. RAPHELE LAMONT LITTLE, <i>Defendant-Appellant.</i>
--

No. 02-4162

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham.
William L. Osteen, District Judge.
(CR-01-321)

Submitted: August 9, 2002

Decided: September 19, 2002

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Joseph H. Craven, Durham, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Sandra J. Hairston, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Ralphele Lamont Little appeals his conviction following a jury trial of bank robbery, 18 U.S.C.A. § 2113(a) (West 2001); bank robbery with a dangerous weapon, 18 U.S.C.A. § 2113(d); carrying and brandishing a firearm in a crime of violence, 18 U.S.C.A. § 924(c)(1)(A)(ii) (West 2001); possession of a firearm by a felon, 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) (2000); and aiding and abetting the same, 18 U.S.C. § 2 (2000). Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

On appeal, Little contends the evidence at trial was insufficient to support his convictions for carrying and brandishing a firearm in a crime of violence and possession of a firearm by a felon. Taking the evidence in the light most favorable to the Government, we find a reasonable trier of fact could have found Little guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. *See Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942).

Little next contends the district court erred in providing the jury with an extensive supplemental instruction regarding possession. Because Little did not object to the instruction, review is for plain error. *See United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725, 732-35 (1993). We find no error, plain or otherwise.

Accordingly, we affirm Little's conviction. 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