UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-4391

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

TRACY LASHAWN PLANTER,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Max O. Cogburn, Jr., District Judge. (3:23-cr-00255-MOC-DCK-1)

Submitted: May 20, 2026 Decided: September 2, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: John G. Baker, Federal Public Defender, Jared P. Martin, Assistant Federal Public Defender, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellant. Russ Ferguson, United States Attorney, Anthony J. Enright, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Following a bench trial, Defendant Tracy Planter was convicted of one count of possessing a firearm as a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). Planter now appeals his conviction, contending that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress the firearm that law enforcement recovered during what the Government contends, and the district court held, was a lawful inventory search of the trunk of his vehicle. *See United States v. Planter*, No. 3:23-cr-255, 2024 WL 5112752 (W.D.N.C. Dec. 13, 2024).

Having carefully reviewed the parties' briefs and the record on appeal, we conclude that the district court did not reversibly err in finding that the firearm was recovered during a lawful inventory search. *See United States v. Treisman*, 71 F.4th 225, 234 (4th Cir. 2023) ("[P]olice officers may inventory a vehicle without a warrant if: (1) the vehicle is in the lawful custody of the police; (2) the inventory search is routine and conducted pursuant to standard police procedures; and (3) the search aims to secure the car or its contents and not to gather incriminating evidence against the owner."). Accordingly, we affirm. 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