

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-4511**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JESUS RAMIREZ AVILEZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. Samuel G. Wilson, District Judge. (CR-04-54-SGW)

---

Submitted: April 20, 2006

Decided: April 24, 2006

---

Before MICHAEL, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Daniel R. Bieger, COPELAND & BIEGER, P.C., Abingdon, Virginia, for Appellant. Craig Jon Jacobsen, Assistant United States Attorney, Edward Albert Lustig, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Jesus Ramirez Avilez appeals his conviction and sentence for conspiracy to distribute 500 grams or more of methamphetamine and 50 grams or more of cocaine, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 846 (2000). Avilez's attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that, in his opinion, there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Although concluding that such allegations lacked merit, counsel claims on appeal that there was insufficient evidence to support Avilez's conviction. Avilez was notified of his right to file a supplemental pro se brief, but did not do so. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

In the Anders brief, counsel asserts that there was insufficient evidence to support Avilez's conviction. We disagree. Avilez was discovered by law enforcement officials in a house with other suspected drug traffickers. Items discovered in the house included methamphetamine, cocaine, baggies, ingredients to make drugs, scales, balance sheets, cell phones, and cash. Moreover, several of Avilez's co-defendants testified against him at trial, noting his participation in setting up drug buys and hiding drugs from police.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Avilez's conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of

his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED