

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-4678

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LEVAR VINCENT BROWN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. G. Steven Agee, Circuit Judge, sitting by designation; Samuel G. Wilson, District Judge. (7:12-cr-00026-SGW-1)

Submitted: February 22, 2013

Decided: March 22, 2013

Before DAVIS, KEENAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Wade T. Anderson, FRITH ANDERSON & PEAKE, P.C., Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellant. Thomas T. Cullen, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Levar Vincent Brown appeals his conviction and 120-month armed career criminal sentence imposed following his guilty plea to possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (2006). On appeal, Brown's counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning whether Brown's guilty plea was knowing and voluntary. Brown was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief but did not file one. Finding no error, we affirm.

The sole issue raised in the Anders brief is whether Brown's guilty plea was knowing and voluntary. Our review of the plea hearing reveals that the district court substantially complied with Rule 11 in conducting the plea colloquy, and committed no error warranting correction on plain error review. See United States v. General, 278 F.3d 389, 393 (4th Cir. 2002) (providing standard of review); United States v. Olano, 507 U.S. 725, 732 (1993) (detailing plain error standard). Thus, the district court did not err in finding Brown's guilty plea knowing and voluntary.

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 Brown, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Brown 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 thereof was served on Brown. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal conclusions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED