

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-4280

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LARRY SHANE KING,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. James A. Beaty, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:14-cr-00454-JAB-1)

Submitted: December 10, 2015

Decided: December 30, 2015

Before MOTZ and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lisa S. Costner, LISA S. COSTNER, P.A., Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Clifton Thomas Barrett, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Larry Shane King appeals the district court's judgment sentencing him to 151 months of imprisonment pursuant to his conviction for conspiring to manufacture quantities of a mixture and substance containing a detectable amount of methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 846 (2012). King's counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), certifying that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case, as well as King's pro se supplemental brief, and have found no meritorious issues. Before accepting King's guilty plea, the district court conducted a thorough plea colloquy, satisfying the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 and ensuring that King's plea was knowing, voluntary, and supported by an independent factual basis. See United States v. DeFusco, 949 F.2d 114, 116 (4th Cir. 1991). The district court made no significant procedural error at sentencing, see Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007), and King has not rebutted our appellate presumption that his within-Guidelines sentence is substantively reasonable. See United States v. Louthian, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 135 S. Ct. 421 (2014).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's criminal judgment. This court requires that counsel inform King, in

writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If King 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 King. 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