## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

## No. 14-6619

DAVID JOSEPH SANCHEZ, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

MARIE VARGO, Warden, Sussex II State Prison,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:13-cv-00400-REP)

Submitted: March 17, 2015

Before WILKINSON and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Decided: March 18, 2015

Carolyn M. Sweeney, Joshua C. Toll, Sara A. Silverstein, Samuel E. Doran, Stephen D. Saltarelli, KING & SPALDING LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellant. Mark R. Herring, Attorney General, Victoria Johnson, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

PER CURIAM:

David Sanchez, Jr., appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. Sanchez was convicted in 1999 of capital murder and related offenses and is serving a sentence of life plus eighteen years without the possibility of parole. The sole issue raised in this appeal is whether Sanchez is entitled to retroactive application of <u>Miller v. Alabama</u>, 132 S. Ct. 2455 (2012). In <u>Miller</u>, the Supreme Court held that the Eighth Amendment prohibits a mandatory sentence of life without parole for an offender who was under the age of eighteen at the time of the offense. <u>Id.</u> at 2461. Sanchez was seventeen when he committed the relevant crimes.

This case is governed by our recent decision in <u>Johnson v.</u> <u>Ponton</u>, \_\_\_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_\_, 2015 WL 924049 (4th Cir. 2015). In <u>Johnson</u>, we held "that the <u>Miller</u> rule is not retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review." <u>Id.</u> at \*1. In light of <u>Miller</u>, we affirm the denial of Sanchez's § 2254 petition. 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

2