

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-4449**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JUVENTINO BENITEZ RODRIGUEZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. James A. Beaty, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:15-cr-00415-JAB-1)

---

Submitted: January 31, 2017

Decided: February 2, 2017

---

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, John A. Duberstein, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Graham Tod Green, Assistant United States Attorney, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Juventino Benitez Rodriguez pled guilty to distribution of methamphetamine, 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) (2012), and possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking offense, 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) (2012). He was sentenced to a total term of 134 months' imprisonment. On appeal, counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning the reasonableness of Rodriguez's sentence. Although informed of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, Rodriguez has not done so. Finding no error, we affirm.

We review Rodriguez'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)). 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. See Rita v. United States, 551 U.S. 338, 347 (2007); United States v. Louthian, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir. 2014).

We have reviewed the record and conclude that the district 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 18 U.S.C. § 3353(a) factors, selected a sentence not based on clearly erroneous facts, and sufficiently explained the chosen sentence. Furthermore, Rodriguez's sentence was within the Guidelines range. Therefore, we conclude that Rodriguez's sentence is reasonable.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious grounds for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Rodriguez, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Rodriguez 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 Rodriguez. 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