

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-4444

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

PAUL JOHNSON, a/k/a Michael Johnson, a/k/a
Sheriff Omar Carmichael,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen,
Senior District Judge. (1:06-cr-00147-WLO)

Submitted: November 30, 2007

Decided: March 13, 2008

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, William C. Ingram, First
Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for
Appellant. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Harry L.
Hobgood, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North
Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Following a jury trial, Paul Johnson was convicted of bank robbery, robbery of a credit union with a dangerous weapon, use and carrying of a firearm during a crime of violence, and possession of a firearm and ammunition by a person previously convicted of a felony. On appeal, he contends that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress evidence discovered during the stop of him and the search of his person and vehicle. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

This court reviews the factual findings underlying a motion to suppress for clear error, and the district court's legal determinations *de novo*. See Ornelas v. United States, 517 U.S. 690, 699 (1996). When a suppression motion has been denied, this court reviews the evidence in the light most favorable to the government. See United States v. Seidman, 156 F.3d 542, 547 (4th Cir. 1998).

With these standards in mind, and having reviewed the transcript of the suppression hearing and the parties' briefs, we conclude that the district court did not err in denying the motion to suppress. Accordingly, we affirm Johnson's convictions. 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