

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-4167

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

HUNTER VAUGHAN EURE,

Defendant - Appellant.

PRIVACY INTERNATIONAL; ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION;
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CRIMINAL DEFENSE LAWYERS,

Amici Supporting Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (2:16-cr-00043-RGD-DEM-1)

Submitted: May 16, 2018

Decided: May 25, 2018

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeremy C. Kamens, Federal Public Defender, Andrew W. Grindrod, Assistant Federal
Public Defender, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Norfolk, Virginia,

for Appellant. Dana J. Boente, United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, Elizabeth M. Yusi, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, Richard D. Cooke, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee. Caroline Wilson Palow, Scarlet Kim, PRIVACY INTERNTIONAL, London, United Kingdom; James R. Theuer, JAMES R. THEUER, PLLC, Norfolk, Virginia, for Amicus Privacy International. Cindy Cohn, Mark Rumold, Andrew Crocker, ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION, San Francisco, California, for Amicus Electronic Frontier Foundation. Elizabeth Franklin-Best, BLUME, FRANKLIN-BEST & YOUNG, LLC, Columbia, South Carolina, for Amicus National Association Of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Hunter Vaughan Eure pled guilty, pursuant to a conditional plea agreement, to possession of child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252(a)(4)(B), 2256(1) & (2) (2012). The district court sentenced Eure to 24 months' imprisonment. On appeal, Eure challenges the denial of his pretrial motion to suppress.

In *United States v. McLamb*, 880 F.3d 685 (4th Cir. 2018), we addressed a substantially similar challenge to the same warrant at issue here and concluded that, even if the warrant was unconstitutional, the good faith exception precluded suppression of the evidence. *Id.* at 689-90. To the extent that any of Eure's arguments are not expressly addressed by *McLamb*, we have considered those claims and find them to be without merit.

Accordingly, we affirm the criminal 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