

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-5107

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ARNULFO RAFAEL SALCIDO-DEHUMA,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (4:07-cr-00010-F-3)

Submitted: July 16, 2008Decided: August 13, 2008

Before MICHAEL and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Slade C. Trabucco, SULLIVAN, TRABUCCO & WAGONER, LLP, Wilmington, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anne M. Hayes, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Arnulfo Rafael Salcido-Dehuma ("Dehuma") pled guilty, without a written agreement, to conspiracy to distribute more than fifty grams of methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2000), and to possession with the intent to distribute more than fifty grams of methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) (2000). The district court sentenced Dehuma to 120 months' imprisonment on each count, to run concurrently. Dehuma timely appealed.

Dehuma's attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), questioning the reasonableness of Dehuma's sentence. Counsel states, however, that he has found no meritorious grounds for appeal. Dehuma received notice of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but did not file one. Finding no meritorious grounds for appeal, we affirm.

Here, counsel does not assert that the district court erred in determining the applicable Guidelines range, and our review of the record reveals no error. Dehuma was sentenced to the statutory minimum term of imprisonment, and we conclude that his sentence is reasonable.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. This court

requires that counsel inform Dehuma, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Dehuma 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 Dehuma.

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