

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-4812

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RICKY BRADLEY COOKE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:16-cr-00266-CCE-1)

Submitted: August 28, 2017

Decided: September 19, 2017

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James B. Craven III, Durham, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anand P. Ramaswamy, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ricky Bradley Cooke pled guilty to aiding and abetting in the transportation of an individual with the intent that such individual engage in the business of prostitution, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2 (2012), and 18 U.S.C.A. § 2421 (West 2015 & Supp. 2017). The district court sentenced Cooke to a term of imprisonment in accordance with the Sentencing Guidelines range and the statutory maximum for that offense. Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Although notified of his right to do so, Cooke has not filed a pro se brief. After careful consideration of the entire record, we affirm.

Our review reflects that Cooke knowingly and intelligently pled guilty pursuant to a valid plea agreement, and that his sentence is procedurally and substantially reasonable. Cooke argues that the appellate waiver in his plea agreement does not bar his current appeal because prosecutors committed misconduct when, in a separate 2015 case, they filed an affidavit that allegedly contained perjured statements. The 2015 case was dismissed, however, and Cooke is not serving a sentence related to that 2015 case. Thus, this claim is meritless.

In accordance with *Anders*, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious grounds for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. We deny counsel's motion to withdraw at this stage of the proceedings. Counsel is required to inform Cooke, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Cooke 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 Cooke.

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