

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-4041

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TAMARLO DENNELL HALL, a/k/a Tomarlo Hall,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., District Judge. (3:18-cr-00288-RJC-DSC-1)

Submitted: June 23, 2022

Decided: June 27, 2022

Before WYNN and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: J. Edward Yeager, Jr., Cornelius, North Carolina, for Appellant. Dena J. King, United States Attorney, Anthony J. Enright, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tamarlo Dennell Hall pleaded guilty, without a written plea agreement, to possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2). The district court sentenced Hall to 72 months' imprisonment. On appeal, Hall argues that his guilty plea is invalid because he was not informed of each element of the offense during the Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 hearing. We affirm.

Because Hall neither objected during the Rule 11 proceeding nor moved to withdraw his guilty plea in the district court, we review the validity of his plea for plain error. *United States v. Sanya*, 774 F.3d 812, 815 (4th Cir. 2014). To prevail under the plain error standard, Hall “must demonstrate not only that the district court plainly erred, but also that this error affected his substantial rights.” *Id.* at 816. After reviewing the record, we conclude that Hall has not made such a showing. *See Greer v. United States*, 141 S. Ct. 2090, 2100 (2021); *see also United States v. Moody*, 2 F.4th 180, 197-98 (4th Cir. 2021) (explaining government is not required to prove defendant knew he was prohibited from possessing firearm to convict under § 922(g)).

We therefore 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