

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-4480**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

REGINALD EARL BULLOCK,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, District Judge. (1:13-cr-00408-TDS-1)

---

Submitted: November 24, 2014

Decided: December 4, 2014

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, Greg Davis, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Ripley Rand, United States Attorney, Stephen T. Inman, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Reginald Earl Bullock appeals his sentence after pleading guilty to possession of a firearm by a felon in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2012). On appeal, Bullock contends that his sentence is unreasonable because it is greater than necessary to accomplish the goals of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2012). We affirm.

We review a criminal sentence for reasonableness using an abuse of discretion standard. United States v. McManus, 734 F.3d 315, 317 (4th Cir. 2013) (citing Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007)). Because Bullock does not point out any procedural improprieties in his sentence, we limit our review to its substantive reasonableness. See United States v. Wallace, 515 F.3d 327, 333-34 (4th Cir. 2008). We presume a sentence within or below a properly calculated Guidelines range is substantively reasonable. United States v. Susi, 674 F.3d 278, 289 (4th Cir. 2012). The presumption can only be rebutted by showing that the sentence is unreasonable when measured against the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors. United States v. Louthian, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 135 S. Ct. 421 (2014).

We have reviewed the record and Bullock's arguments, and we conclude that his sentence is substantively reasonable. "[D]istrict courts have extremely broad discretion when determining the weight to be given [to] each of the § 3553(a)

factors." United States v. Jeffery, 631 F.3d 669, 679 (4th Cir. 2011). The district court correctly calculated that Bullock's Guidelines range was 57 to 71 months and reasonably determined that a 63-month sentence in the middle of the range was appropriate in this case in light of his arguments and the § 3553(a) factors. Based on a totality of the circumstances, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion, and we accord deference to its sentencing decisions. See United States v. Rivera-Santana, 668 F.3d 95, 106 (4th Cir. 2012).

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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED