

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 07-4421

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

AARON LAMONT LITTLE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, Senior District Judge. (1:06-cr-00360-WLO)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2007

Decided: December 18, 2007

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas N. Cochran, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Robert Albert Jamison Lang, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Aaron Lamont Little pled guilty to one count of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2000). The district court sentenced him to 115 months' imprisonment, three years of supervised release, and a \$100 assessment. Little timely appealed.

Little's attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but questioning whether the sentence imposed was unduly harsh. Little did not file a pro se supplemental brief, despite being notified of his right to do so. The Government declined to file a responding brief. Finding no error, we affirm.

We find that the district court properly applied the Sentencing Guidelines and considered the relevant sentencing factors before imposing the 115-month sentence. 18 U.S.C.A. § 3553(a) (West 2000 & Supp. 2007). Additionally, we find that the sentence imposed was reasonable. See United States v. Johnson, 445 F.3d 339, 341 (4th Cir. 2006); Rita v. United States, 127 S. Ct. 2456, 2462-69 (2007) (upholding presumption of reasonableness accorded within-guidelines sentence).

Pursuant to Anders, we have examined the entire record and find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm Little's conviction and sentence. We further deny counsel's

pending motion to withdraw. This court requires that counsel inform Little, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Little requests that such 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 Little.

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