

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-5168**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID C. WHITE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. John T. Copenhaver, Jr., District Judge. (2:00-cr-00155-1)

---

Submitted: June 30, 2011

Decided: July 5, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mary Lou Newberger, Federal Public Defender, Lex A. Coleman, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Jonathan D. Byrne, Appellate Counsel, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellant. R. Booth Goodwin, II, United States Attorney, William B. King, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David C. White appeals the district court's revocation of his term of supervised release. On appeal, White argues that the district court clearly erred in finding that he jointly possessed ammunition found inside his home, and abused its discretion in revoking his term of supervised release. We affirm.

We review the district court's decision to revoke a defendant's supervised release for an abuse of discretion. United States v. Copley, 978 F.2d 829, 831 (4th Cir. 1992). The district court need only find a violation of a condition of supervised release by a preponderance of the evidence. 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3) (2006). We review factual determinations informing the conclusion that a violation occurred for clear error. United States v. Carothers, 337 F.3d 1017, 1019 (8th Cir. 2003).

Our review of the record leads us to conclude that the district court neither clearly erred in finding that White jointly possessed the ammunition found inside his home, nor abused its discretion in revoking White's supervised release. Accordingly, 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED