

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-4478**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

QUENTIN VIRGIL WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, Senior District Judge. (1:03-cr-00024-WLO)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2006

Decided: December 13, 2006

---

Before NIEMEYER and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis C. Allen, III, Federal Public Defender, John A. Dusenbury, Jr., Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Angela Hewlett Miller, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Following a hearing at which Quentin Virgil Williams admitted to violating conditions of his supervised release, the district court revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to twenty-four months in prison. Williams appealed. His attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 366 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting his opinion that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but raising the issue of whether the district court erred in imposing a twenty-four month sentence. The Government did not file a reply brief, and although advised of his right to do so, Williams did not file a pro se supplemental brief. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

We recently held in United States v. Crudup, 461 F.3d 433 (4th Cir. 2006), that we review sentences imposed upon the revocation of supervised release to determine whether the sentence is "plainly unreasonable." In this case, Williams's sentence was not above the statutory maximum of two years of imprisonment, the court considered the Chapter 7 advisory policy statement range, and the court stated a proper basis for sentencing Williams to twenty-four months of imprisonment. See Crudup, 461 F.3d at 437. Specifically the court noted Williams's poor adjustment to supervised release and his repeated violations. Because Williams's sentence was neither procedurally nor substantively unreasonable, we find that his sentence is not plainly unreasonable.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm. This court requires that counsel inform Williams, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Williams 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 Williams. 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