

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-4203

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

GLORIA A. CANNON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (6:01-cr-00499-GRA)

Submitted: July 25, 2006

Decided: July 25, 2006

Before WILLIAMS, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David W. Plowden, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. William Corley Lucius, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Following a hearing at which Gloria Cannon admitted to violating conditions of her supervised release, the district court revoked Cannon's release and imposed a three-month term of imprisonment. Cannon appeals. Her attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 367 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but requesting that we review the imposition of sentence. Cannon was advised of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but did not file such a brief.

Cannon's admitted violations justified revocation of her supervised release. Further, the district court properly calculated Cannon's guidelines range of three to nine months' imprisonment, and imposed a three-month term, well below the applicable statutory maximum. Nothing in the record suggests any error on the part of the district court, and we conclude the sentence imposed was proper.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record for any meritorious issues and have found none. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. This court requires counsel to inform his client, in writing, of her 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 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 set forth in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED