

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-4455

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

COURTNEY LAMONT PAULING, a/k/a Marcus Lamont Book, a/k/a
Rode,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Spartanburg. J. Michelle Childs, District
Judge. (7:14-cr-00790-JMC-1)

Submitted: January 14, 2016

Decided: January 19, 2016

Before AGEE, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lora Blanchard, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville,
South Carolina, for Appellant. Alan Lance Crick, Assistant
United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Courtney Pauling pled guilty to possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(e) (2012). The district court sentenced Pauling to 120 months' imprisonment followed by three years of supervised release. Pauling appeals his sentence. Counsel has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising one issue but stating that, in her view, there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Finding no error, we affirm.

Counsel challenges the 120-month sentence imposed by the district court for plain error. Under the plain error standard, Pauling must show: (1) there was error; (2) the error was plain; and (3) the error affected his substantial rights. United States v. Olano, 507 U.S. 725, 732-34 (1993). Even when these conditions are satisfied, this court may exercise its discretion to notice the error only if the error "seriously affect[s] the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings." Id. at 736 (internal quotation marks omitted).

We find no plain error in the calculation of Pauling's sentence because the district court computed the correct sentencing range under the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual (2015) before imposing the 120-month sentence.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire 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 Pauling, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Pauling 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 Pauling.

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