

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-4345**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ZEE ZEE ZELAZURRO,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 14-4346**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ZEE ZEE ZELAZURRO,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District  
of South Carolina, at Columbia. Margaret B. Seymour, Senior  
District Judge. (3:06-cr-00561-MBS-1)

---

Submitted: October 30, 2014

Decided: November 7, 2014

---

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James P. Rogers, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Julius Ness Richardson, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Zee Zee Zelazurro appeals from the revocation of his supervised release and the resulting twelve-month sentence of imprisonment. Counsel has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), certifying that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning whether Zelazurro's sentence is plainly unreasonable. Although notified of his right to do so, Zelazurro has not filed a supplemental brief. We affirm.

"A district court has broad discretion when imposing a sentence upon revocation of supervised release." United States v. Webb, 738 F.3d 638, 640 (4th Cir. 2013). "We will affirm a revocation sentence if it is within the statutory maximum and is not "'plainly unreasonable.'" Id. (quoting United States v. Crudup, 461 F.3d 433, 438 (4th Cir. 2006)). "In making this determination, we first consider whether the sentence imposed is procedurally or substantively unreasonable." Id. Only if we so find will "we . . . then decide whether the sentence is plainly unreasonable." Crudup, 461 F.3d at 439.

After a careful review of the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Zelazurro. In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment

revoking Zelazurro's supervised release and imposing sentence. This court requires that counsel inform Zelazurro, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Zelazurro 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 Zelazurro. 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