

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-4313**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KIMBERLY ANN JONES,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, District Judge. (1:12-cr-00310-TDS-1)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2013

Decided: November 25, 2013

---

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stacey D. Rubain, QUANDER & RUBAIN, P.A., Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Frank Joseph Chut, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pursuant to a plea agreement, Kimberly Ann Jones pled guilty to two counts of bank fraud and one count of aggravated identity theft. The district court sentenced her to 32 months' imprisonment. Jones'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 the propriety of the guilty plea and the reasonableness of the sentence. Although advised of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief, Jones has not done so. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

In the absence of a motion in the district court to withdraw a guilty plea, this court's review of the plea colloquy is for plain error. United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 525 (4th Cir. 2002). After reviewing the plea agreement and the transcript of the plea hearing, we conclude that the district court fully complied with the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11, and that Jones's guilty plea was knowing and voluntary.

We have reviewed Jones's sentence and conclude 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 Jones, 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) (2012) factors in light of Jones'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 Jones, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Jones 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 Jones. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED