

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-4203

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PEDRO MALDONADO-SANCHEZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L.
Voorhees, District Judge. (5:14-cr-00072-RLV-DSC-3)

Submitted: October 13, 2016

Decided: October 17, 2016

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

D. Baker McIntyre III, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellant.
Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville,
North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pedro Maldonado-Sanchez appeals the judgment imposed following his guilty plea to conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent cocaine and money laundering conspiracy. On appeal, Maldonado-Sanchez's attorney 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 sentence is reasonable. Maldonado-Sanchez was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not filed a brief. We affirm.

Having carefully reviewed the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Maldonado-Sanchez. See United States v. Martinovich, 810 F.3d 232, 242 (4th Cir. 2016) (stating standard of review). We discern no procedural sentencing error, see Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007), and Maldonado-Sanchez has failed to rebut the presumption that his sentence is substantively reasonable, see United States v. Louthian, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir. 2014). Additionally, we have reviewed the guilty plea colloquy and find that Maldonado-Sanchez's plea was both knowing and voluntary, and supported by a sufficient factual basis. See United States v. Sanya, 774 F.3d 812, 813 (4th Cir. 2014) (noting plea colloquy is reviewed for plain error where

defendant does not move to withdraw his guilty plea); Fed. R. Crim. P. 11.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and find no meritorious ground for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment and we deny counsel's motion to withdraw. This court requires that counsel inform Maldonado-Sanchez, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Maldonado-Sanchez requests that the 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 Maldonado-Sanchez. 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