

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

February 19, 2013

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 12-40094
Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

LEO PATRICK COLLINS,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 5:10-CR-1-1

Before KING, CLEMENT, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

The attorney appointed to represent Leo Patrick Collins 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). Collins has filed a response as well as a motion for leave to file a supplemental response. The motion to file a supplemental response is GRANTED.

The record is insufficiently developed to allow consideration at this time of Collins's claims of ineffective assistance of counsel; such claims generally

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 12-40094

“cannot be resolved on direct appeal when [they have] not been raised before 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 brief and the relevant portions of the record reflected therein, as well as Collins’s responses. 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.