UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-4396

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

          Plaintiff - Appellee,

   v.

WAYNE ANDERSON VANCE,

          Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. John T. Copenhaver, Jr., Senior District Judge. (2:10-cr-00196-3)

Submitted: April 12, 2022   Decided: May 6, 2022

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Richard W. Weston, WESTON | ROBERTSON, Hurricane, West Virginia, for Appellant. William S. Thompson, United States Attorney, Patrick J. Jeffrey, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

PER CURIAM:

Wayne Anderson Vance has noted an appeal from the district court's judgment revoking his supervised release and sentencing him to 11 months in prison, arguing that the prison term is plainly unreasonable and greater than necessary to achieve the goals of sentencing. We dismiss the appeal.

Vance's term of supervised release commenced in April 2020. The probation officer later petitioned the district court to revoke Vance's supervised release, alleging he had committed multiple violations of the terms of his supervision. Vance admitted to the violations alleged at the revocation hearing, and the district court revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to 11 months in prison. The district court did not impose an additional term of supervised release.

During the pendency of this appeal, Vance was released from prison. Because Vance has served his revocation prison term and faces no subsequent term of supervised release, there is no longer a live controversy regarding the prison term. This appeal is therefore moot. *United States v. Hardy*, 545 F.3d 280, 282-85 (4th Cir. 2008); *see United States v. Ketter*, 908 F.3d 61, 65 (4th Cir. 2018).

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal as moot. 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.

DISMISSED