

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-4306

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAGOBERTO ENAMORADO,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, District Judge. (1:11-cr-00284-TDS-1)

Submitted: October 11, 2012

Decided: October 15, 2012

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Louis C. Allen III, Federal Public Defender, Mireille P. Clough, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dagoberto Enamorado pled guilty to illegal reentry by a deported alien, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a), (b)(1) (2006). The district court sentenced him to 21 months' imprisonment. Enamorado'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 Enamorado's sentence was reasonable. Enamorado was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not done so. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

We have reviewed Enamorado's sentence and conclude that it was properly calculated and that the sentence imposed was reasonable. See Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007); United States v. Llamas, 599 F.3d 381, 387 (4th Cir. 2010). The district court followed the necessary procedural steps in sentencing Enamorado, 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 in light of Enamorado's individual characteristics and history. 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 Enamorado, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Enamorado 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 Enamorado. 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