

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 15-1424

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Carl S. Reeder

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Western District of Missouri - Kansas City

Submitted: July 2, 2015

Filed: July 2, 2015

[Unpublished]

Before WOLLMAN, LOKEN, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Carl Reeder directly appeals after he pled guilty to being a felon in possession of ammunition, and the district court¹ sentenced him below the calculated Guidelines

¹The Honorable Howard F. Sachs, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

range. His counsel has moved to withdraw, and filed a brief under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing that the district court imposed a substantively unreasonable sentence. Having jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, this court affirms.

This court concludes that the district court did not impose a substantively unreasonable sentence. The court specifically referenced several of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, and there is no indication that the court overlooked a relevant factor, gave significant weight to an improper or irrelevant factor, or committed a clear error of judgment in weighing relevant factors. *See United States v. Feemster*, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc); *see also United States v. Moore*, 581 F.3d 681, 683 (8th Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (“[W]here a district court has sentenced a defendant below the advisory guidelines range, it is nearly inconceivable that the court abused its discretion in not varying downward still further.”). An independent review of the record under *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), reveals no nonfrivolous issues for appeal.

The judgment is affirmed. Counsel’s motion to withdraw is granted.
