

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-5150

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRACIE WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Patrick Michael Duffy, Senior District Judge. (2:04-cr-00848-PMD-4)

Submitted: August 19, 2010

Decided: November 8, 2010

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

H. Stanley Feldman, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellant. Michael Rhett DeHart, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tracie Lashaun Williams appeals the district court's judgment revoking her probation and imposing three months' imprisonment. Williams' attorney filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but raising the issue of whether Williams' sentence was unreasonable. Williams was informed of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has not done so. Because Williams has been discharged from federal custody, because her sentence did not include a term of supervised release, and because there are no continuing collateral consequences from the district court's judgment on revocation of probation, Williams' appeal is moot. See Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 10 (1998).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record and found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore dismiss Williams' appeal as moot. This court requires that counsel 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, 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.

DISMISSED