

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 15-40714  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

March 31, 2016

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff–Appellee,

v.

DANIEL FRIAS GOMEZ,

Defendant–Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 5:13-CR-1055

---

Before KING, CLEMENT, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The attorney appointed to represent Daniel Frias Gomez has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *United States v. Flores*, 632 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2011). Frias Gomez has filed a response. The record is not sufficiently developed to allow us to make a fair evaluation of Frias Gomez’s claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; we therefore decline to consider the claim without

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 15-40714

prejudice to collateral review. *See United States v. Isgar*, 739 F.3d 829, 841 (5th Cir. 2014).

We have reviewed counsel's brief and the relevant portions of the record reflected therein, as well as Frias Gomez's response. Although counsel addresses the validity of Frias Gomez's appeal waiver, counsel does not fully and meaningfully discuss the district court's compliance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11. An appeal waiver in the plea agreement does not waive the district court's compliance with Rule 11 or the need to brief this issue adequately in an *Anders* brief. *See United States v. Carreon-Ibarra*, 673 F.3d 358, 362 n.3 (5th Cir. 2012); *see also United States v. Brown*, 328 F.3d 787, 789-90 (5th Cir. 2003). Nevertheless, our independent review confirms that the guilty plea was knowing and voluntary. We therefore concur with counsel's assessment that the appeal presents no nonfrivolous issue for appellate review. Accordingly, the motion for leave to withdraw is GRANTED, counsel is excused from further responsibilities herein, and the APPEAL IS DISMISSED. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2. Frias Gomez's motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED. *See United States v. Wagner*, 158 F.3d 901, 902-03 (5th Cir. 1998).