

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-4464**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CARLOS MAURICE SINCLAIR,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:15-cr-00309-BO-1)

---

Submitted: April 25, 2017

Decided: May 11, 2017

---

Before DUNCAN, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas P. McNamara, Federal Public Defender, Eric J. Brignac, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellant. John Stuart Bruce, United States Attorney, Jennifer P. May-Parker, First Assistant United States Attorney, Kristine L. Fritz, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Carlos Sinclair pled guilty to being a felon in possession of a firearm, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2012). Sinclair appeals his sentence, arguing that it is substantively unreasonable. This court reviews a defendant's sentence "under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard." *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 41 (2007). Because Sinclair does not assert any procedural sentencing error, we review only the substantive reasonableness of the sentence, considering "the totality of the circumstances to see whether the sentencing court abused its discretion in concluding that the sentence it chose satisfied the standards set forth in [18 U.S.C.] § 3553(a) [(2012)]." *United States v. Gomez-Jimenez*, 750 F.3d 370, 383 (4th Cir. 2014) (internal quotation marks omitted). "Any sentence that is within or below a properly calculated Guidelines range is presumptively reasonable." *United States v. Louthian*, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir. 2014). "Such a presumption can only be rebutted by showing that the sentence is unreasonable when measured against the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors." *Id.* We conclude that Sinclair fails to rebut the presumption of reasonableness accorded his below-Guidelines sentence.

Accordingly, we 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*