

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-4072**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SHAMSADEEN IBN PURVIS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:04-cr-00495-AW)

---

Submitted: June 30, 2006

Decided: July 21, 2006

---

Before MICHAEL, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James Wyda, Federal Public Defender, Denise C. Barrett, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Michael R. Pauze, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Shamsadeen Ibn Purvis appeals his convictions and sentence to 264 months in prison and three years of supervised release after pleading guilty to obstruction of interstate commerce by robbery in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 1951(a) (2000); using and carrying a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 924(c) (2000); and possession of a firearm by a convicted felon in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (2000). We affirm.

Purvis contends the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over his prosecution because there was no verified complaint and he is a sovereign who unwittingly relinquished his freedom to the United States. This argument is without merit. Subject matter jurisdiction over a federal prosecution is conferred on the district court by 18 U.S.C. § 3231 (2000). United States v. Hartwell, 448 F.3d 707, 716 (4th Cir. 2006). Moreover, "there can be no doubt that Article III permits Congress to assign federal criminal prosecutions to federal courts." Hugi v. United States, 164 F.3d 378, 380 (7th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly, we affirm Purvis's 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