

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-5265**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

OLU CAMPBELL, a/k/a Oluseun Oshosanya,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, Senior District Judge. (1:09-cr-00628-MJG-2)

---

Submitted: May 22, 2012

Decided: June 6, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Howard Margulies, LAW OFFICE OF HOWARD MARGULIES, Columbia, Maryland, for Appellant. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Jefferson M. Gray, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Olu Campbell appeals his conviction by jury of six counts of wire fraud for his participation in a scheme that fraudulently obtained home mortgage loans from a Maryland mortgage lending company, Landmark Funding LLC ("Landmark"). Campbell's lone contention on appeal is that the district court erred in refusing to give the jury his proposed instruction pertaining to Landmark's willful blindness.

The decision to give or refuse a jury instruction is reviewed for abuse of discretion. United States v. Green, 599 F.3d 360, 377 (4th Cir. 2010). The failure to give a requested theory of defense instruction is reversible error "only if the instruction (1) was correct, (2) was not substantially covered by the court's charge to the jury, and (3) dealt with some point in the trial so important that the failure to give the requested instruction seriously impaired the defendant's ability to conduct his defense." Id. at 378 (quotation marks omitted). We have thoroughly examined the record in light of Campbell's assertions and conclude without difficulty that the district court's refusal to give the requested instruction was not an abuse of its discretion.

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

before the court and argument will not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED