US v. Lavonte Hallman Appeal: 16-6306 Doc: 19 Filed: 07/31/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
_	No. 16-6306	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	,	
Plaintiff - App	ellee,	
v.		
LAVONTE LAMONT HALLMAN,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
-		
Appeal from the United States Distriction Charlotte. Max O. Cogburn, Jr., D. 00468-MOC)		
Submitted: July 27, 2017		Decided: July 31, 2017
Before AGEE and FLOYD, Circuit	Judges, and HAMIL	TON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Affirmed by unpublished per curiar	n opinion.	
Lavonte Lamont Hallman, Appe RICHARDS, Davidson, North Card		nn George Guise, COPELAND
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.		

PER CURIAM:

Lavonte Lamont Hallman appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. Hallman challenges his career offender designation based on *Johnson v. United States*, __ U.S. __, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015), which declared the residual clause of the Armed Career Criminal Act unconstitutionally vague.* Hallman's argument is foreclosed by the Supreme Court's recent decision that the Sentencing Guidelines, including the career offender residual clause, "are not subject to a vagueness challenge under the Due Process Clause." *Beckles v. United States*, __ U.S.__, 137 S. Ct. 886, 892 (2017). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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

^{*} Before this court, Hallman clarifies that he believes he is entitled to relief under our decisions in *United States v. Gardner*, 823 F.3d 793 (4th Cir. 2016), and *United States v. Billups*, 652 F. App'x 157 (4th Cir. 2016). These cases do not apply to Hallman as they address armed career criminal designations under the Armed Career Criminal Act, not career offender designations.