

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-4813

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RICHARD WRIGHT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District Judge. (6:05-cr-01163-HMH)

Submitted: May 29, 2009

Decided: June 22, 2009

Before MOTZ and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Debra Y. Chapman, DEBRA Y. CHAPMAN, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Leesa Washington, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Richard Wright pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to distribute fifty grams or more of cocaine base ("crack"), in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2006), and two counts of possession with intent to distribute and distribution of crack, and aiding and abetting the same, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(B) (2006), and 18 U.S.C. § 2 (2006). The district court sentenced Wright to concurrent terms of 168 months in prison. Wright appeals.

Wright's counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that, in her view, there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Counsel questions, however, whether Wright was denied effective assistance of counsel. This court "may address [claims of ineffective assistance] on direct appeal only if the lawyer's ineffectiveness conclusively appears from the record." United States v. Baldovinos, 434 F.3d 233, 239 (4th Cir. 2006). We find that Wright has failed to meet this high standard and therefore decline to review this claim on direct appeal.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal.*

* We have reviewed the claims in Wright's pro se supplemental brief and find them to be without merit.

We therefore affirm Wright's convictions and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform Wright, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Wright 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 representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on Wright.

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