

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 16-4027

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTONIO DENARD TORRENCE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (1:15-cr-00199-WO-1)

Submitted: November 19, 2019

Decided: November 21, 2019

Before WILKINSON and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, John A. Duberstein, Assistant Federal Public Defender, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Matthew G.T. Martin, United States Attorney, Angela H. Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antonio Denard Torrence appeals his conviction for brandishing a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) (2012). He contends that his § 924(c) conviction is invalid because the residual clause in § 924(c)(3)(B) is unconstitutionally vague and Hobbs Act robbery is not a crime of violence under the force clause in § 924(c)(3)(A). Although the Supreme Court has invalidated the residual clause, *United States v. Davis*, 139 S. Ct. 2319, 2336 (2019), this Court has held that Hobbs Act robbery is a crime of violence under the force clause, *United States v. Mathis*, 932 F.3d 242, 266 (4th Cir. 2019). Torrence's § 924(c) conviction is therefore valid, and we affirm the district court's judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED