

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-4577

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NISHON QUINTE RAINNER, a/k/a Rodney Oblin Nicolas, a/k/a
Buddy,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 15-4623

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NISHON QUINTE RAINNER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, Chief District Judge. (1:15-cr-00055-CCB-1; 1:15-cr-00269-CCB-1)

Submitted: June 14, 2016

Decided: June 16, 2016

Before WILKINSON, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Richard Bardos, SCHULMAN, HERSHFIELD & GILDEN, P. A., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Judson T. Mihok, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Nishon Quinte Rainner appeals his convictions, following a jury trial, for two counts of possession of a firearm and ammunition by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (2012), and the district court's judgment, based on these convictions, revoking his supervised release in a separate criminal matter and sentencing him to 18 months' imprisonment consecutive to the 100-month term imposed on the substantive charges. Rainner argues that the district court erred by admitting evidence that the firearms and ammunition had been stolen and by denying his motion for a mistrial. We have reviewed the record and conclude that the district court did not commit reversible error in its evidentiary rulings; the admission of evidence that the firearms were stolen was not an abuse of discretion, United States v. Williams, 445 F.3d 724, 732 (4th Cir. 2006), nor were the court's evidentiary rulings arbitrary or irrational, United States v. Cole, 631 F.3d 146, 153 (4th Cir. 2011). In addition, we conclude there was no basis for granting a mistrial. United States v. Dorlouis, 107 F.3d 248, 257 (4th Cir. 1997). And the district court's curative instruction regarding the Government's statement during its closing argument was sufficient to erase any confusion on the part of the jury. Accordingly, we affirm

the district court's judgments.* 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

* Rainner raises no challenges on appeal to the revocation of his supervised release or to his sentence.