

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-4257**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ERNEST JEROME MASON,

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-00330-CCE-1)

---

Submitted: March 30, 2017

Decided: April 3, 2017

---

Before TRAXLER and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Geoffrey Ryan Willis, WILLIS JOHNSON & NELSON PLLC, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellant. Terry Michael Meinecke, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Ernest Jerome Mason appeals his sentence of 151 months of imprisonment for conspiracy to distribute heroin, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(b)(1)(C), 846 (2012). Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), concluding that there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but questioning whether the sentence imposed by the district court was reasonable. We affirm.

We review Mason's sentence for reasonableness "under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard." *United States v. McCoy*, 804 F.3d 349, 351 (4th Cir. 2015) (quoting *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 41 (2007)), *cert. denied*, 137 S. Ct. 320 (2016). This review entails appellate consideration of both the procedural and substantive reasonableness of the sentence. *Gall*, 552 U.S. at 51. We presume that a sentence imposed within the properly calculated Sentencing Guidelines range is reasonable. *United States v. Louthian*, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir. 2014).

We have reviewed the record and conclude that the court properly calculated the Guidelines range, treated the Guidelines as advisory rather than mandatory, gave the parties an opportunity to argue for an appropriate sentence, considered the relevant statutory factors, selected a sentence not based on clearly erroneous facts, and sufficiently explained the chosen sentence. In addition, the court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to vary downward because Mason had a very serious criminal record. Finally, Mason's sentence of 151 months was at the bottom of the range recommended by the Guidelines. Therefore, we conclude that Mason's sentence is reasonable.

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

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*