

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 3 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

CRISOFORO FIDEL MEJIA-PEDRAZA,
a.k.a. Crisoforo Fidel Pedraza, a.k.a. Javier
Mejia-Pedazo,

Defendant-Appellant.

Nos. 18-10064
18-10065

D.C. Nos. 4:17-cr-01203-JGZ
4:17-cr-50161-JGZ

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Jennifer G. Zipps, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 27, 2018**

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated appeals, Crisoforo Fidel Mejia-Pedraza appeals his guilty-plea conviction and 37-month sentence for reentry of a removed alien, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326, and the revocation of supervised release and 6-month

* 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).

partially concurrent sentence imposed upon revocation. Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Mejia-Pedraza’s counsel has filed a brief stating that there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. Mejia-Pedraza has filed a “motion,” which we treat as a pro se supplemental brief and motion for appointment of new counsel. No 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 in these direct appeals.

Counsel’s motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**. Mejia-Pedraza’s pro se motion for appointment of new counsel is **DENIED**.

AFFIRMED.