

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-4506

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TORIANO HOIVEY BLOCKER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (3:07-cr-00466-CMC-1)

Submitted: May 18, 2009

Decided: June 3, 2009

Before MICHAEL, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Cameron B. Littlejohn, Jr., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Stanley Duane Ragsdale, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Toriano Hoivey Blocker pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to knowingly using or carrying a firearm during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1) (2006) (Count Three), and conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute five grams or more of cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A), 846 (2006) (Count Five). Blocker was sentenced to 270 months in prison. Blocker appealed.

Counsel for Blocker filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), certifying that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal, but questioning whether the district court properly conducted Blocker's guilty plea hearing. Blocker has filed a pro se supplemental brief. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

In the absence of a motion to withdraw a guilty plea in the district court, we review for plain error the adequacy of the guilty plea proceeding under Fed. R. Crim. P. 11. United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 525 (4th Cir. 2002). Our examination of the record shows that the district court fully complied with the requirements of Rule 11. Further, Blocker's plea was knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered, and supported by a factual basis. We therefore find no error.

We have reviewed Blocker's pro se informal brief and find no merit to his claims. 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 Blocker, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Blocker 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 Blocker.

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