

UNPUBLISHED
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>Plaintiff-Appellee,</i> v. LADORA EDWARDS, a/k/a DeDe, <i>Defendant-Appellant.</i>

No. 02-4847

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Virginia, at Abingdon.
James P. Jones, District Judge.
(CR-01-70)

Submitted: May 6, 2003

Decided: May 21, 2003

Before WILLIAMS, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

David L. Harmon, Bristol, Virginia, for Appellant. Morgan E. Scott, Acting United States Attorney, Eric M. Hurt, Assistant United States Attorney, Abingdon, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Ladora Edwards appeals her jury convictions of conspiracy to distribute less than five grams of cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 846 (2000), and possession with intent to distribute less than five grams of cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) (2000). Edwards challenges whether venue was appropriate in the Western District of Virginia regarding her possession count and whether the evidence was sufficient to sustain her convictions. Finding these issues meritless, we affirm.

Edwards argues the district court erred by declining to grant her motion for judgment of acquittal on the ground the evidence was insufficient to show she committed the offense as alleged in the Western District of Virginia. This Court reviews *de novo* the district court's decision to deny a motion for judgment of acquittal. *United States v. Gallimore*, 247 F.3d 134, 136 (4th Cir. 2001). If, when construed in the light most favorable to the Government, substantial evidence exists to support a verdict, the verdict must be sustained. *United States v. Burgos*, 94 F.3d 849, 862 (4th Cir. 1996) (en banc) (citing *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942)). We have reviewed the evidence and find it was sufficient to support the allegation in the indictment that the acts of possession occurred in the Western District of Virginia.

Edwards also challenges the sufficiency of the evidence by arguing the witnesses were not credible and contradicted each other. This Court does not review the credibility of the witnesses and assumes that the jury resolved all contradictions in favor of the Government. *United States v. Wilson*, 115 F.3d 1185, 1190 (4th Cir. 1997). We therefore reject this claim.

Thus, we affirm Edwards' convictions and sentence. 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