

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-4424**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAVON HEBRON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (1:07-cr-00363-AMD-1)

---

Submitted: February 19, 2009

Decided: February 23, 2009

---

Before WILKINSON, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marc L. Resnick, Washington, D.C., for Appellant. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Christopher J. Romano, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ravon Hebron pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2006). He was sentenced to 120 months' imprisonment. On appeal, Hebron argues that he was deprived of a fair trial because he entered his guilty plea involuntarily, without proper advice from counsel, and under coercion and duress. We affirm.

To the extent Hebron claims his guilty plea was involuntary and the district court erred in accepting it, any error committed during the Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 hearing is reviewed for plain error because Hebron did not move to withdraw his guilty plea. See United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 524-26 (4th Cir. 2002). We have carefully reviewed the transcript of the Rule 11 hearing and find no plain error in the district court's acceptance of the guilty plea. See United States v. DeFusco, 949 F.2d 114, 119-20 (4th Cir. 1991). A defendant's statements at a guilty plea hearing are presumed true. See Blackledge v. Allison, 431 U.S. 63, 73-74 (1977). Unsupported subsequent allegations are insufficient to overcome representations at the hearing. Id. at 74. We find no evidence that Hebron's plea was not knowing or voluntary. See Unites States v. Marin, 961 F.2d 493, 496 (4th Cir. 1992). Moreover, as there is no ineffective assistance of counsel found

on the face of the record, we decline to consider Hebron's ineffective assistance claim on direct appeal. DeFusco, 949 F.2d at 120-21.

Accordingly, we affirm Hebron's conviction 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