

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-4641**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

HENRY JAMES JORDAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:15-cr-00109-CCE-2)

---

Submitted: May 31, 2016

Decided: June 3, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mark A. Jones, BELL, DAVIS & PITT, PA, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Dana James Boente, Acting United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, Graham Tod Green, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Henry James Jordan pled guilty in accordance with a written plea agreement to bank robbery in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2113(a), and § 2 (2012). He was sentenced to 77 months of imprisonment, the bottom of his properly calculated Sentencing Guidelines range. Jordan appeals and his attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), questioning whether he knowingly and voluntarily pled guilty, but concluding that there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Jordan was advised of the right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has failed to do so. We affirm.

Because Jordan did not attempt to withdraw his guilty plea in the district court, we review this issue for plain error, see United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 527 (4th Cir. 2002) (stating standard), and find none. A review of Jordan's plea hearing reveals it was conducted in compliance with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 and that he knowingly and voluntarily pled guilty.

Pursuant to Anders, we have reviewed the entire record and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Jordan, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Jordan 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 Jordan. 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