

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-4928

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

COREY ANTHONY BEACH,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Patrick Michael Duffy, Senior District Judge. (2:09-cr-01226-PMD-1)

Submitted: April 23, 2015

Decided: May 1, 2015

Before SHEDD, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

J. Robert Haley, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellant. Robert Nicholas Bianchi, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Corey Anthony Beach appeals the district court's judgment revoking his supervised release and sentencing him to 11 months' imprisonment. Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning whether Beach's revocation sentence is plainly unreasonable. Beach was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but he has not done so.

In accordance with Anders, we have thoroughly reviewed the record in this case and conclude that Beach's sentence is not plainly unreasonable and that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. See 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." (internal quotation marks omitted)). This court requires that counsel inform Beach, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Beach 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 Beach.

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