United States Court of Appeals

For th	pe Eighth Circuit
N	No. 14-1883
United	States of America
	Plaintiff - Appellee
	V.
	known as Geraldo Medrano-Rodriguez, also s Gerald Rodriguez
	Defendant - Appellant
	nited States District Court crict of Arkansas - Little Rock
Filed: D	: December 29, 2014 ecember 31, 2014 Inpublished]
Before WOLLMAN, BYE, and MEI	LLOY, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM.	
_	rectly appeals following imposition of sentence plea to a drug offense. His counsel has moved

¹The Honorable Brian S. Miller, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

to withdraw, and has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing that the court erred in refusing to grant Medrano-Rodriguez an additional one-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(b). Medrano-Rodriguez has filed a pro se brief, arguing for the first time on appeal that the government breached the plea agreement by withholding a section 3E1.1(b) motion. The government has moved to dismiss based on an appeal waiver in the written plea agreement.

We deny the government's motion to dismiss, because we have some concern as to whether the district court drew appellant's attention to the waiver in the manner contemplated by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(b)(1)(N). See United States v. Boneshirt, 662 F.3d 509, 516 (8th Cir. 2011), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 1613 (2012).

Reviewing for plain error, we reject as meritless Medrano-Rodriguez's pro se argument that the government breached the plea agreement. See United States v. Yellow, 627 F.3d 706, 708-09 (8th Cir. 2010). Further, we need not reach the merits of the argument in counsel's Anders brief. Medrano-Rodriguez was subject to a 120-month statutory minimum sentence, which would have trumped the lower range resulting from an additional level of reduction for acceptance of responsibility–producing a Guidelines range of 120-121 months in prison. The district court sentenced Medrano-Rodriguez to 120 months, the very lowest sentence that the court could have imposed in the circumstances of this case. See United States v. Chacon, 330 F.3d 1065, 1066 (8th Cir. 2003). Finally, having independently reviewed the record under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues.

Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we affirm.

_