

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

No. 15-20371
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

March 10, 2016

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

STACEY LAIR LEE-EASILEY, also known as Stacey L. Easiley, also known
as Stacey Lee,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:13-CR-662

Before KING, CLEMENT, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

The Federal Public Defender appointed to represent Stacey Lair Lee-Easiley 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). Lee-Easiley has filed a response. The record is not sufficiently developed to allow us to make a fair evaluation of Lee-Easiley's

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 15-20371

claims of ineffective assistance of counsel; we therefore decline to consider the claims without prejudice to collateral review. *See United States v. Isgar*, 739 F.3d 829, 841 (5th Cir. 2014).

We have reviewed counsel's brief and the relevant portions of the record reflected therein, as well as Lee-Easiley's response. Although counsel addresses the validity of Lee-Easiley's appeal waiver, counsel does not discuss the district court's compliance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11. An appeal waiver in the plea agreement does not waive the district court's compliance with Rule 11 or the need to brief this issue adequately in an *Anders* brief. *See United States v. Carreon-Ibarra*, 673 F.3d 358, 362 n.3 (5th Cir. 2012); *see also United States v. Brown*, 328 F.3d 787, 789-90 (5th Cir. 2003). Nevertheless, our independent review confirms that the guilty plea was knowing and voluntary. We therefore 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. Lee-Easiley's motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED.