

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-4298

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SCOTTY RAY PULLIAM,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:06-cr-00015-CCE-1)

Submitted: November 22, 2016

Decided: November 29, 2016

Before DIAZ and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ames Colby Chamberlin, LAW OFFICES OF AMES C. CHAMBERLIN, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Michael A. DeFranco, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Scotty Ray Pulliam appeals the 21-month sentence imposed by the district court upon revocation of his supervised release. On appeal, Pulliam'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 Pulliam's revocation sentence. Although notified of his right to do so, Pulliam has not filed a pro se supplemental brief. Our review of the record reveals no error in the district court's explanation of Pulliam'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 Pulliam, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Pulliam 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 Pulliam. 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