UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6621

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Petitioner - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY BUSSIE,

Respondent - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (5:14-hc-02186-BR)

Submitted: January 28, 2016 Decided: March 3, 2016

Before KEENAN, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas P. McNamara, Federal Public Defender, Stephen C. Gordon, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellant. Thomas G. Walker, United States Attorney, Jennifer P. May-Parker, Jennifer D. Dannels, Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Bussie appeals the district court's order committing him to the custody of the Attorney General under 18 U.S.C. § 4246 (2012). The district court found by clear and convincing evidence that Bussie "is presently suffering from a mental disease or defect as a result of which his release would create a substantial risk of bodily injury to another person or serious damage to property of another." 18 U.S.C. § 4246(d) (2012).

We review the district court's factual determination for clear error. United States v. Cox, 964 F.2d 1431, 1433 (4th Cir. 1992). A factual finding is clearly erroneous when the reviewing court is "left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." Anderson v. City of Bessemer City, 470 U.S. 564, 573 (1985) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

We have reviewed the record, the district court's decision, and the briefs of the parties, and we conclude that the district court's determination is supported by the record and is not clearly erroneous. Accordingly, we affirm the order of the district court. 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