NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

MAY 11 2017

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. JAE HO CHUNG, a.k.a. Jae Chung, a.k.a. Jay Chung, a.k.a. Steve Chung, Defendant-Appellant.	No. 16-50186 D.C. No. 2:14-cr-00262-JAK MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
John A. Kronstadt, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 8, 2017**

Before: REINHARDT, LEAVY, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Jae Ho Chung appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges his guilty-plea convictions and 63-month concurrent sentences for conspiracy to commit bank fraud and bank fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1344, 1349. Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Chung's counsel has filed a

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

brief stating that there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. We have provided Chung the opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief. No pro se supplemental brief or answering brief has been filed.

Chung waived his right to appeal his conviction, with the exception of an appeal based on a claim that his pleas were involuntary. He also waived the right to appeal most aspects of his sentence. Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), discloses no arguable grounds for relief as to Chung's plea or any aspects of the sentence that fall outside the scope of the waiver. We therefore affirm as to those issues. We dismiss the remainder of the appeal in light of the valid appeal waiver. *See United States v. Watson*, 582 F.3d 974, 988 (9th Cir. 2009).

Counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED.**

AFFIRMED in part; DISMISSED in part.