UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

—————————

No. 13-4638

—————————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

             Plaintiff - Appellee,

      v.

KEITH PAUL,

             Defendant - Appellant.

—————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern
District of West Virginia, at Charleston.   David A. Faber,
Senior District Judge. (2:07-cr-00044-2)

—————————

Submitted: March 24, 2014   Decided: April 4, 2014

—————————

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

—————————

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

—————————

Mark William Browning, SHUMAN, MCCUSKEY & SLICER, PLLC,
Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellant. R. Booth Goodwin II,
United States Attorney, Monica D. Coleman, Assistant United
States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

—————————

PER CURIAM:

Keith Paul appeals the district court's order revoking his supervised release. Paul contends that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress evidence allegedly seized in violation of his Fourth Amendment rights. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

We review de novo a district court's legal conclusions on a motion to suppress. United States v. McGee, 736 F.3d 263, 269 (4th Cir. 2013), pet. for cert. filed, ___ S. Ct. ___ (Feb. 14, 2014) (No. 13-8810). Paul's claim that seized evidence should have been suppressed fails because the exclusionary rule does not apply in supervised release revocation proceedings. See Pa. Bd. of Prob. & Parole v. Scott, 524 U.S. 357, 365 (1998) (stating that "exclusionary rule . . . is incompatible with the traditionally flexible, administrative procedures of parole revocation"); United States v. Armstrong, 187 F.3d 392, 393-95 (4th Cir. 1999) (applying Scott in context of federal supervised release revocation proceedings).

We therefore affirm the district court's order. 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

2