

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-4598**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTONIO LAMAR WATKINS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (8:12-cr-00304-TMC-1)

---

Submitted: March 31, 2014

Decided: May 9, 2014

---

Before WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jonathan M. Milling, MILLING LAW FIRM, LLC, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. William N. Nettles, United States Attorney, Carrie Fisher Sherard, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antonio Lamar Watkins appeals from his convictions after a jury trial for drug and firearm offenses. On appeal, Watkins only argues that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress evidence. Finding no error, we affirm.

In considering the denial of a suppression motion, we review the district court's legal determinations de novo and its factual findings for clear error. United States v. Kelly, 592 F.3d 586, 589 (4th Cir. 2010). The court "view[s] the facts in the light most favorable to the Government, as the party prevailing below." United States v. Black, 707 F.3d 531, 534 (4th Cir. 2013). The court also "defer[s] to the district court's credibility findings, as it is the role of the [trial] court to observe witnesses and weigh their credibility during a pre-trial motion to suppress." United States v. Griffin, 589 F.3d 148, 150-51 n.1 (4th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted).

We have reviewed the transcript of the motion to suppress hearing and the district court's detailed ruling on the motion from the bench and find no clear error in the district court's finding of facts or error in its legal conclusions. We defer to its credibility findings. Because the district court did not err in denying the motion to suppress, we affirm the judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and

legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED