## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No	•	1	1	_	6	5	2	4

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAYCONUS CORNELLIUS SCOTT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (7:08-cr-00211-HMH-8)

Submitted: June 16, 2011 Decided: June 21, 2011

Before NIEMEYER and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jayconus Cornellius Scott, Appellant Pro Se. David Calhoun Stephens, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Jayconus Cornellius Scott appeals the district court's order denying his motion seeking credit toward his prison sentence imposed after the revocation of his term of supervised release. Upon revocation of Scott's supervised release, which was imposed as part of his sentence for conspiracy to defraud the United States, the district court sentenced Scott to six months' imprisonment in February 2011. In April 2011, Scott moved the district court for credit toward the revocation sentence, arguing that he was entitled to credit for time served in a state prison from September 22, 2010 until sentencing on February 14, 2011.

District courts, however, are not authorized to compute credit for time spent in official detention when sentencing a convict. <u>United States v. Wilson</u>, 503 U.S. 329, 333 (1992). Rather, only the Attorney General, acting through the Bureau of Prisons, may compute sentencing credit. <u>Id.</u> at 334-35. The district court was therefore without the authority to award Scott credit for the time he spent in state custody.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order.

<u>United States v. Scott</u>, No. 7:08-cr-00211-HMH-8 (D.S.C. Apr. 7,

2011). 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