

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-4269

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

STAYKA DOLJEVA,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.
(4:07-cr-00479-RBH-3)

Submitted: April 20, 2009

Decided: May 11, 2009

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John D. Elliott, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant.
William E. Day, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pursuant to a written plea agreement, Stayka Doljeva pled guilty to conspiracy to commit marriage fraud, 18 U.S.C. § 371 (2006), and was sentenced to two months in prison. She now appeals. Her attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising two issues but concluding that there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Doljeva was advised of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief but did not file such a brief.

After reviewing the transcript of Doljeva's Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 hearing, we conclude that the district court fully complied with the Rule. Further, we note that there is nothing in the record to suggest that the sentence of imprisonment, as opposed to a term of probation, resulted from collateral, impermissible influences on the district judge. We conclude that the sentence was reasonable. See Gall v. United States, 128 S. Ct. 586, 597 (2007). Finally, after a thorough review of the record in accordance with Anders, we find that there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm.

This court requires counsel to inform his client, in writing, of her 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, counsel may move in this court for leave to

withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy of the motion was served on the client. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal questions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not significantly aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED