

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-4387

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM PARAS LAMB, a/k/a William Paris Lamb,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Wilmington. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (7:20-cr-00011-D-1)

Submitted: May 31, 2022

Decided: June 7, 2022

Before NIEMEYER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part, dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: G. Alan DuBois, Federal Public Defender, Eric Joseph Brignac, Chief Appellate Attorney, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellant. David A. Bragdon, Assistant United States Attorney, Kristine L. Fritz, Assistant United States Attorney, Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Paras Lamb pled guilty, pursuant to a written plea agreement, to possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1), and possession of a firearm by a felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924. Under the plea agreement, Lamb agreed to waive his right to appeal his conviction and sentence. The district court sentenced Lamb to 120 months' imprisonment on the § 922(g) count, and a consecutive 78 months' imprisonment on the § 924(c) count, for a total term of 198 months' imprisonment. Lamb timely appealed.

Counsel for Lamb 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 substantive reasonableness of Lamb's below-Guidelines sentence. Although informed of his right to do so, Lamb has not filed a pro se supplemental brief. The Government moves to dismiss the appeal as barred by the appellate waiver included in Lamb's plea agreement. We affirm in part and dismiss in part.

We review the validity of an appeal waiver de novo and "will enforce the waiver if it is valid and the issue[s] appealed [are] within the scope of the waiver." *United States v. Adams*, 814 F.3d 178, 182 (4th Cir. 2016). Generally, if the district court fully questions a defendant regarding the waiver of his right to appeal during a plea colloquy performed in accordance with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11, and the record shows that the defendant understood the waiver's significance, the waiver is both valid and enforceable. *United States v. Thornsbury*, 670 F.3d 532, 537 (4th Cir. 2012). Our review of the record confirms that

Lamb knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to appeal. We therefore conclude that the waiver is valid.

In accordance with *Anders*, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious grounds for appeal. We therefore grant in part the Government's motion to dismiss and dismiss the appeal as to all issues within the waiver's scope. We affirm the remainder of the judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Lamb, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Lamb 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 Lamb. 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 IN PART,
DISMISSED IN PART*