

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-4075

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAYMOND C. ASBERRY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (6:11-cr-02200-TMC-1)

Submitted: July 28, 2016

Decided: August 1, 2016

Before MOTZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lora Blanchard, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. William Jacob Watkins, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond C. Asberry appeals the fourteen-month sentence imposed by the district court upon revocation of Asberry's supervised release. On appeal, Asberry's counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), certifying that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning whether the district court adequately explained Asberry's revocation sentence. Although notified of his right to do so, Asberry has not filed a pro se supplemental brief. Our review of the record reveals no error in the district court's explanation of Asberry's sentence. See United States v. Webb, 738 F.3d 638, 640 (4th Cir. 2013); United States v. Thompson, 595 F.3d 544, 547 (4th Cir. 2010).

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