

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-4250

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

OMAR DUPRAZ CRITTINGTON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Max O. Cogburn, Jr.,
District Judge. (3:11-cr-00083-MOC-DCK-1)

Submitted: October 9, 2015

Decided: October 20, 2015

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tony E. Rollman, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellant. Amy
Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville,
North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Omar Dupraz Crittington appeals from the district court's judgment revoking his supervised release and imposing a 24-month prison term and a 12-month term of supervised release. Crittington's counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but questioning whether trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance in failing to explain adequately to Crittington the consequences of his admission to violating the terms of his supervised release. The Government declined to file a brief. Crittington was informed of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but he has not done so. We affirm.

We decline to reach Crittington's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. Unless an attorney's ineffectiveness conclusively appears on the face of the record, ineffective assistance claims generally are not addressed on direct appeal. United States v. Benton, 523 F.3d 424, 435 (4th Cir. 2008). Because the record does not conclusively establish ineffective assistance by Crittington's trial counsel, we deem this claim inappropriate for resolution on direct appeal. See United States v. Baptiste, 596 F.3d 214, 216 n.1 (4th Cir. 2010).

Additionally, in accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the remainder of the record in this case and have found no

meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Crittington, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Crittington 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 Crittington.

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