

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 16-4093

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Raymond Scott Standafer

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Southern District of Iowa - Davenport

Submitted: July 5, 2017

Filed: July 11, 2017

[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, ARNOLD, and MURPHY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Raymond Standafer challenges the sentence the district court¹ imposed upon his guilty plea to a drug offense, which he committed while on supervised release.

¹The Honorable John A. Jarvey, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.

His counsel has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing that the district court, in sentencing Mr. Standafer, abused its discretion by failing to give adequate consideration to his history of drug addiction, and by imposing consecutive prison terms for the drug offense and the revocation of supervised release.

We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Mr. Standafer, and in particular, we conclude that the court did not commit an error of judgment in weighing his drug addiction against other relevant factors. See United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (discussing appellate review of sentencing decisions under abuse-of-discretion standard; abuse of discretion occurs when court fails to consider relevant factor, gives significant weight to improper or irrelevant factor, or commits clear error of judgment in weighing appropriate factors). We further conclude that the imposition of consecutive prison terms was proper. See U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3 cmt. n.4(C) (recommending that sentence for instant offense be imposed consecutively to sentence imposed for revocation where defendant commits instant offense while serving period of supervised release).

Having independently reviewed the record pursuant to Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we have found no nonfrivolous issues for appeal. Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we affirm.
