UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-4145

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAMES G. PROPES, JR., a/k/a Tommy E. Clemons,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Huntington. Robert C. Chambers, Chief District Judge. (3:11-cr-00212-1)

Submitted: August 4, 2015 Decided: August 19, 2015

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gregory J. Campbell, CAMPBELL LAW OFFICE, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellant. R. Booth Goodwin II, United States Attorney, Lisa G. Johnston, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James G. Propes, Jr., appeals the district court's order revoking his supervised release and sentencing him to 10 months' imprisonment followed by 50 months of supervised release. He argues that the district court abused its discretion when it imposed the special conditions of supervised release included in his original sentence. We affirm.

We typically review for abuse of discretion the imposition of special conditions of supervised release. United States v. Worley, 685 F.3d 404, 407 (4th Cir. 2012). Because Propes failed to object to their imposition in the district court, however, our review is for plain error only. United States v. Webb, 738 F.3d 638, 640 (4th Cir. 2013).

We discern no plain error in the district court's imposition of these special conditions of supervised release. Propes did not challenge these conditions when they were imposed as part of his original sentence and may not do so now. See United States v. Johnson, 138 F.3d 115, 117-18 (4th Cir. 1998) (holding that, in appeal from the revocation of supervised release, this court lacks jurisdiction to examine the original sentencing proceeding in which the term of supervised release was imposed). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the material

before this court and argument will not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED