United States Court of AppealsFOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

	No. 06-3693
United States of America,	* *
Appellee,	* * Appeal from the United States
V.	* District Court for the * Western District of Arkansas.
Johnny L. Cornelious,	* * [UNPUBLISHED]
Appellant.	*

Submitted: November 6, 2007 Filed: November 13, 2007

Before BYE, RILEY, and MELLOY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

After Johnny L. Cornelious (Cornelious) pled guilty to distributing more than 5 grams of cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), the district court¹ sentenced Cornelious to 87 months in prison and 5 years of supervised release. On appeal, Cornelious's counsel filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and moved to withdraw. Cornelious filed a pro se supplemental brief. For the reasons discussed below, we reject all of the arguments raised on appeal, and we grant counsel's withdrawal motion.

¹The Honorable Harry F. Barnes, United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

First, the sentencing transcript shows Cornelious was held responsible for only 5-20 grams of cocaine base, consistent with the amounts in the indictment and plea agreement. Second, Cornelious's claim he was never provided with a copy of the presentence report is not supported by the record. Third, a direct criminal appeal is not a vehicle to remedy an alleged information leak by the government that has caused a defendant past hardship in prison. Fourth, matters to which defense counsel made and withdrew objections below--the application of an aggravating-role enhancement and the calculation of the criminal history score--are deemed intentionally relinquished or abandoned and need not be reviewed on appeal. See United States v. Olano, 507 U.S. 725, 733 (1993); United States v. Tulk, 171 F.3d 596, 600 (8th Cir. 1999). Fifth, Cornelious's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel must be raised, if at all, in a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. See United States v. Ramirez-Hernandez, 449 F.3d 824, 827 (8th Cir. 2006).

After reviewing the record independently under <u>Penson v. Ohio</u>, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we conclude there are no nonfrivolous issues for appeal. We affirm the judgment of the district court and grant counsel's motion to withdraw.