

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-4133**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

TULIO DANILO SOLARES,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge. (7:06-cr-00151-3)

---

Submitted: August 30, 2007

Decided: September 5, 2007

---

Before MICHAEL, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David Seay, Jr., LAW OFFICE OF DAVID SEAY, JR., LLC, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. Elizabeth Jean Howard, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tulio Danilo Solares pled guilty to conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A), 846 (2000), and was sentenced to 108 months imprisonment. Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal, but questioning whether the district court fully complied with the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11. Although informed of his right to file a supplemental pro se brief, Solares has not done so.

Because Solares did not move in the district court to withdraw his guilty plea, his challenge to the adequacy of the Rule 11 hearing is reviewed for plain error. See United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 525 (4th Cir. 2002) (holding that "plain error analysis is the proper standard for review of forfeited error in the Rule 11 context"). Our review of the record leads us to conclude that the district court fully complied with the mandate of Rule 11 in accepting Solares' guilty plea.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. 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 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 in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED