## United States Court of Appeals

For the Eighth Circuit	
No. 16-4124	
United States of Am	nerica
Plaintiff -	- Appellee
v.	
Michael Charles Gar	rreans
Defendant	- Appellant
Appeal from United States I for the Southern District of Iowa	
Submitted: June 15, Filed: June 20, 20	
Before LOKEN, ARNOLD, and MURPHY, Circ	ruit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Michael Charles Garreans directly appeals the below-Guidelines-range sentence imposed by the district court<sup>1</sup> after he pleaded guilty to possessing child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(4)(B). Garreans's counsel has

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Stephanie M. Rose, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.

moved to withdraw, and has filed a brief under <u>Anders v. California</u>, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the sentence as substantively unreasonable.

Counsel's argument fails. Upon review of the sentencing transcript, we conclude that the district court's carefully considered sentence was not an abuse of discretion. See 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a); United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (standard of review); United States v. Stults, 575 F.3d 834, 849 (8th Cir. 2009) (where court makes individualized assessment based on facts presented, addressing proffered information in consideration of § 3553(a) factors, sentence is not unreasonable); United States v. Lazarski, 560 F.3d 731, 733-34 (8th Cir. 2009) (where court varied downward from Guidelines range, it is "nearly inconceivable" that it abused its discretion in not varying downward further still).

Further, having independently reviewed the record under <u>Penson v. Ohio</u>, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues for appeal. We note, however, that the amended judgment incorrectly cites "18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(4)(B)" (prohibiting sale of, or possession with intent to sell, child pornography) as the offense of conviction, and thus we modify the judgment to substitute "18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(4)(B)" for "18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(4)(B)." <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 2106 (appellate court may modify any judgment brought before it for review).

Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we affirm the judgment, as modified.

-2-