

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 17-50306  
Conference Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

August 27, 2018

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

DIMAS JUAN ANTONIO RODRIGUEZ-GONZALEZ, also known as Dimas  
Juan Rodriguez-Gonzalez,

Defendant-Appellant

-----  
consolidated w/ No. 17-50309  
-----

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

DIMAS RODRIGUEZ GONZALEZ, also known as Dimas Rodriguez, also  
known as Dimas Juan Rodriguez-Gonzalez, also known as Dimas Juan  
Rodriguez Rodriguez-Gonzalez, also known as Dimas Juan Rodriguez, also  
known as DimasJuan Antonio Rodriguez-Gonzalez,

Defendant-Appellant

No. 17-50306  
c/w No. 17-50309

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:16-CR-2056-1  
USDC No. 3:17-CR-148-1

---

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, SMITH, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The Federal Public Defender appointed to represent Dimas Juan Antonio Rodriguez-Gonzalez has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed briefs in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *United States v. Flores*, 632 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2011). Rodriguez-Gonzalez has filed a response. The record is not sufficiently developed to allow us to make a fair evaluation of Rodriguez-Gonzalez's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; we therefore decline to consider the claim without prejudice to collateral review. *See United States v. Isgar*, 739 F.3d 829, 841 (5th Cir. 2014).

We have reviewed counsel's briefs and the relevant portions of the record reflected therein, as well as Rodriguez-Gonzalez's response. We concur with counsel's assessment that the appeals present no nonfrivolous issue for appellate review. Accordingly, the motion for leave to withdraw is GRANTED, counsel is excused from further responsibilities herein, and the APPEALS ARE DISMISSED. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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