

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-4339

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROBERT MICHAEL MEO, a/k/a Michael Robert Meo,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:14-cr-00470-CCE-1)

Submitted: February 29, 2016

Decided: April 1, 2016

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, John A. Duberstein, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Michael Francis Joseph, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Michael Meo pleaded guilty, pursuant to a written plea agreement, to bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2113(a), 2 (2012). The district sentenced him to 156 months' imprisonment followed by 3 years of supervised release. On appeal, Meo's 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 the district court imposed a substantively unreasonable sentence. Meo did not file a pro se supplemental brief, despite receiving an extension of time to do so.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious grounds for appeal. The district court made no significant procedural error at sentencing, see Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007), and Meo does not rebut 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 judgment.

This court requires that counsel inform Meo, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Meo 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 Meo.

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