

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-5022

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID McCLEOD,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge.
(4:03-cr-843-TLW)

Submitted: May 22, 2008

Decided: May 27, 2008

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael A. Meetze, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellant. Arthur Bradley Parham, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David McCleod appeals the district court's order revoking his supervised release and sentencing him to ten months' imprisonment. McCleod's attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but suggesting that the district court erred in ordering revocation and sentencing McCleod based on supervised release violations. McCleod has been informed of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not done so.

Pursuant to Anders, we have examined the entire record and find no meritorious issues for appeal. McCleod admitted to violations of his supervised release, and his sentence, which was within the advisory guidelines range, was reasonable. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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 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 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