

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-4275**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER LEVON TURNER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Durham. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr.,  
Senior District Judge. (1:06-cr-00321-NCT)

---

Submitted: June 30, 2009

Decided: July 8, 2009

---

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nils E. Gerber, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant.  
Randall Stuart Galyon, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,  
Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Levon Turner was convicted following a jury trial of six counts of distribution of cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(B)-(C) (2006), and was sentenced to 121 months in prison. Turner timely appealed.

Counsel for Turner filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), certifying that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Turner was notified of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not done so.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal.\* We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Turner, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Turner requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from

---

\* This appeal was held in abeyance pending decision in United States v. Antonio, 311 F. App'x 679 (4th Cir. 2009) (No. 07-4791). Upon review, we conclude this case is unaffected by our decision in Antonio.

representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on Turner.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED