

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-4930**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TERRENCE O'BRIEN WASHINGTON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:14-cr-00148-NCT-1)

---

Submitted: May 19, 2015

Decided: May 21, 2015

---

Before NIEMEYER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, Mireille P. Clough, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Terry Michael Meinecke, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Terrence O'Brien Washington pleaded guilty to one count of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon and was sentenced to 41 months of imprisonment. Counsel has filed an Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) brief, finding no meritorious issues, but questioning whether the sentence is substantively reasonable. Finding no error, we affirm.

This court reviews a sentence for reasonableness, applying an abuse of discretion standard. Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). We first review for significant procedural errors, including whether the district court failed to calculate or improperly calculated the Sentencing Guidelines range, treated the Guidelines as mandatory, failed to consider the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2012) factors, or failed to adequately explain its chosen sentence. Id. If we find the sentence procedurally reasonable, we then examine substantive reasonableness, considering the totality of the circumstances. Id. If the sentence is within the Guidelines range, this court applies a presumption of reasonableness. United States v. Mendoza-Mendoza, 597 F.3d 212, 217 (4th Cir. 2010).

Washington contends that his sentence is greater than necessary to accomplish the goals of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). We find that Washington's sentence is substantively reasonable. The district court meaningfully responded to defense counsel's

arguments for a sentence in the middle of the Guidelines range, and explained its chosen sentence. Furthermore, Washington presents no evidence to rebut the presumption of reasonableness applicable to his within-Guidelines sentence.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Washington's conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform Washington, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Washington 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 Washington.

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