

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-4535**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAMES L. DEAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge. (6:09-cr-00893-HFF-1)

---

Submitted: November 30, 2010

Decided: December 6, 2010

---

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James B. Loggins, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. William Jacob Watkins, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James L. Dean pled guilty to conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute methamphetamine. The district court sentenced him to eighty-seven months imprisonment. Dean's counsel filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that, in counsel's view, there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but questioning whether Dean's sentence was reasonable. Dean was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not done so. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

In the absence of a motion to withdraw a guilty plea, this court reviews the adequacy of the guilty plea pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 for plain error. See United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 525 (4th Cir. 2002). Our review of the transcript of the plea hearing leads us to conclude that the district court fully complied with Rule 11 in accepting Dean's guilty plea. The court ensured that Dean understood the charge against him and the potential sentence he faced, that he entered his plea knowingly and voluntarily, and that the plea was supported by an independent factual basis. See United States v. DeFusco, 949 F.2d 114, 116, 119-20 (4th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, we affirm Dean's conviction.

We have also reviewed Dean's sentence and determined that it was properly calculated and that the sentence imposed

was reasonable. See Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007); see United States v. Llamas, 599 F.3d 381, 387 (4th Cir. 2010). The district court followed the necessary procedural steps in sentencing Dean, appropriately treated the sentencing guidelines as advisory, properly calculated and considered the applicable guidelines range, and weighed the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2006) factors. We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing the chosen sentence. See Gall, 552 U.S. at 41; United States v. Allen, 491 F.3d 178, 193 (4th Cir. 2007) (applying appellate presumption of reasonableness to within guidelines sentence).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. This court requires that counsel inform Dean, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Dean 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 Dean. 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