

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-4034**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

LATONIA WALLACE, a/k/a Pooter,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. Joseph Robert Goodwin, District Judge. (CR-03-187)

---

Submitted: June 21, 2006

Decided: June 29, 2006

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Andrew J. Katz, THE KATZ WORKING FAMILIES LAW FIRM, LC, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellant. Charles T. Miller, Acting United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, John Lanier File, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Beckley, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Latonia Wallace pled guilty to conspiracy to distribute cocaine base and cocaine in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2000). Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting there are no meritorious issues for review; however, raising the issue of whether this court properly decided in a prior opinion to reverse the district court's order granting Wallace's motion to suppress. Wallace did not file a pro se supplemental brief. We affirm the conviction and sentence.

We will not revisit the issue of this court's prior decision to reverse the district court's order granting Wallace's motion to suppress. See United States v. Wallace, No. 04-4643, 2005 WL 481592 (4th Cir. Mar. 2, 2005) (unpublished).

Accordingly, we affirm the conviction and sentence. In accordance with the requirements of Anders, we have reviewed the record and find no meritorious issues. This court requires counsel inform his client, in writing, of her right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests a petition be filed, but counsel believes 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