

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-4382**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LEE ROY ROBERTS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:12-cr-00629-HMH-1)

---

Submitted: October 25, 2013

Decided: January 2, 2014

---

Before DIAZ and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Benjamin T. Stepp, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Lee Roy Roberts appeals the district court's judgment imposing a sentence of 235 months in prison after he pled guilty to conspiracy to distribute oxycodone in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(C), and 846. Roberts's attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting, in his opinion, that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but raising the issue of whether it was unreasonable for the district court to sentence Roberts to serve 235 months in prison. Roberts was notified of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has not done so. We affirm.

We review a sentence under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard. Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). The first step in this review requires us to ensure that the district court committed no significant procedural error, such as improperly calculating the Guidelines range, failing to consider the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, or failing to adequately explain the sentence. United States v. Carter, 564 F.3d 325, 328 (4th Cir. 2009). If the sentence is procedurally reasonable, we then consider the substantive reasonableness of the sentence imposed, taking into account the totality of the circumstances. Gall, 552 U.S. at 51. We presume that a sentence within a properly calculated Guidelines

range is substantively reasonable. United States v. Susi, 674 F.3d 278, 289 (4th Cir. 2012).

We have reviewed the record and conclude that Roberts's sentence is procedurally and substantively reasonable, and the district court did not err or abuse its discretion in sentencing him. The district court properly calculated his Guidelines range and reasonably determined that a sentence at the high end of the range was appropriate in this case.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform his or her client, in writing, of his or 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.

AFFIRMED