

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 16, 2011

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 10-40709

Summary Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

HUGO ESPINOZA-GONZALEZ, also known as Joel Albert Espinoza,

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:09-CR-217-1  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before REAVLEY, DENNIS, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The Federal Public Defender appointed to represent Hugo Espinoza-Gonzalez has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *United States v. Flores*, 632 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2011). Espinoza-Gonzalez has filed a response. The record is insufficiently developed to allow consideration at this time of Espinoza-Gonzalez's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; such a claim generally "cannot be resolved on direct appeal when the claim has not been raised before

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 10-40709

the district court since no opportunity existed to develop the record on the merits of the allegations.” *United States v. Cantwell*, 470 F.3d 1087, 1091 (5th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). We have reviewed counsel’s briefs and the relevant portions of the record reflected therein, as well as Espinoza-Gonzalez’s response. We concur with counsel’s assessment that the appeal presents no nonfrivolous issue for appellate review. Accordingly, the motion for leave to withdraw is GRANTED, counsel is excused from further responsibilities herein, and the APPEAL IS DISMISSED. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.