

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-5092

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

VINCENTE ROMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Louise W. Flanagan, Chief District Judge. (5:05-cr-174-1)

Submitted: September 26, 2006

Decided: September 28, 2006

Before WIDENER and WILKINSON, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas P. McNamara, Federal Public Defender, Devon L. Donahue, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellant. Frank D. Whitney, United States Attorney, Anne M. Hayes, Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Vincente Roman appeals his eighteen-month term of imprisonment imposed after the district court revoked his supervised release. He argues that the sentence is unreasonable because it was higher than the applicable advisory sentencing range of six to twelve months pursuant to policy statements in Chapter 7 of the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual. Pursuant to United States v. Crudup, ___ F.3d ___, ___, 2006 WL 2243586, at *3 (4th Cir. Aug. 7, 2006), revocation sentences are reviewed to determine whether they are "plainly unreasonable" with regard to the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors applicable to these sentences. We find that Roman's sentence is not plainly unreasonable, because the district court sufficiently stated a proper basis for its conclusion that Roman should be sentenced to a lengthier sentence than one within the advisory range. We therefore affirm Roman's 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