

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCT 2 2017

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

ROBERT MICHAEL NUNEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 17-10032

D.C. No. 1:15-cr-00236-LJO

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Lawrence J. O'Neill, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 26, 2017\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Robert Michael Nunez appeals from the revocation of supervised release and the 24-month sentence imposed upon revocation. Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Nunez's counsel has filed a brief stating that there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. We have

---

\* 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).

provided Nunez the opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief. No pro se supplemental brief or answering brief has been filed.

Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), discloses no arguable grounds for relief on direct appeal.

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

**AFFIRMED.**