

**UNPUBLISHED****UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 17-4285**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SANDRA E. KUHNS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Martinsburg. Gina M. Groh, Chief District Judge. (3:13-cr-00058-GMG-RWT-1)

---

Submitted: October 17, 2017

Decided: October 19, 2017

---

Before FLOYD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Aaron D. Moss, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Kristen M. Leddy, Research and Writing Specialist, Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellant. Lara Kay Ombs-Botteicher, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Sandra E. Kuhns appeals the district court's judgment revoking her supervised release and sentencing her to one year and one day's imprisonment. Kuhns' counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious issues for appeal but questioning whether Kuhns' sentence was substantively unreasonable. Kuhns was advised of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but she has not filed one. We affirm.

"A district court has broad discretion when imposing a sentence upon revocation of supervised release. We will affirm a revocation sentence if it is within the statutory maximum and is not plainly unreasonable." *United States v. Webb*, 738 F.3d 638, 640 (4th Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted). "When reviewing whether a revocation sentence is plainly unreasonable, we must first determine whether it is unreasonable at all." *United States v. Thompson*, 595 F.3d 544, 546 (4th Cir. 2010). A sentence is substantively reasonable if the district court states a proper basis for concluding the defendant should receive the sentence imposed, up to the statutory maximum. *United States v. Crudup*, 461 F.3d 433, 440 (4th Cir. 2006).

Applying these standards, we find that Kuhns' sentence is not unreasonable, much less plainly so. Further, 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 judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Kuhns, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Kuhns 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 Kuhns.

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*