## United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

	No. 09-2842
United States of America,	*
Appellee,	<ul> <li>* Appeal from the United States</li> <li>* District Court for the</li> </ul>
V.	<ul> <li>* Northern District of Iowa.</li> <li>*</li> </ul>
Robert Orlando Bolden,	* [UNPUBLISHED] *
Appellant.	*

Submitted: April 14, 2010 Filed: April 19, 2010

Before LOKEN, BYE, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Robert Bolden challenges the reasonableness of the sentence the district court<sup>1</sup> imposed after revoking his supervised release. Upon careful review, we hold that the district court did not clearly err in finding by a preponderance of the evidence that Bolden had violated the conditions of his supervised release, see <u>United States v.</u> <u>Carothers</u>, 337 F.3d 1017, 1019 (8th Cir. 2003) (government must prove by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Linda R. Reade, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa.

preponderance of evidence that defendant violated supervised release condition; district court's finding that violation occurred is reviewed for clear error; district court's credibility determinations at supervised release revocation hearing are virtually unreviewable on appeal), and we conclude that the revocation sentence is not unreasonable, <u>see United States v. Tyson</u>, 413 F.3d 824, 825 (8th Cir. 2005) (per curiam) (revocation sentences are reviewed for unreasonableness in accordance with <u>United States v. Booker</u>, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We grant counsel's motion to withdraw, subject to counsel informing Bolden about procedures for seeking rehearing or filing a petition for certiorari.