

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-4230

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM DELANO RICE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:14-cr-00232-CCE-1)

Submitted: September 9, 2015

Decided: September 11, 2015

Before SHEDD, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

J. Clark Fisher, RANDOLPH & FISCHER, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Ripley Rand, United States Attorney, Harry L. Hobgood, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Delano Rice appeals the criminal judgment entered against him after a jury convicted him of one count each of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2012); possession with intent to distribute marijuana, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(D) (2012); and possession of ammunition by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2012). On appeal, Rice asserts that the Government's evidence was insufficient to establish that: (1) he possessed the firearm and ammunition for which he was convicted; and (2) the marijuana he possessed was for anything other than personal use. Rice has also filed a motion to file a pro se supplemental brief.* Finding no error, we affirm.

"We review a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence de novo[.]" United States v. Bran, 776 F.3d 276, 279 (4th Cir. 2015). If, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the Government, we find there is substantial evidence to support

* Because Rice is represented by counsel who has filed a merits brief, he is not entitled to file a pro se supplemental brief. Accordingly, we deny his motion. See United States v. Penniegraft, 641 F.3d 566, 569 n.1 (4th Cir. 2011) (denying motion to file pro se supplemental brief because the defendant was represented by counsel).

the conviction, we will affirm the jury's verdict. See United States v. Hager, 721 F.3d 167, 179 (4th Cir. 2013). "Substantial evidence is such evidence that a reasonable finder of fact could accept as adequate and sufficient to support a conclusion of a defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). We have reviewed the record and have considered Rice's arguments and conclude that, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the Government, there is substantial evidence to support the jury's convictions on all counts.

Accordingly, we deny Rice's motion to file a pro se supplemental brief and 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