United States Court of Appeals

For the Eighth Circuit

	2 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
	No. 14-2567	
	United States of America	
	Plaintiff - Appellee	
	v.	
	Kingsley Onumbu	
	Defendant - Appellan	nt
	al from United States District Cothe District of Nebraska - Omaha	
\$	Submitted: December 17, 2014 Filed: December 22, 2014 [Unpublished]	
Before SMITH, BOWMAN	N, and COLLOTON, Circuit Jud	ges.
PER CURIAM.		
	irectly appeals after imposition of to a fraud offense. Counsel mov	-

¹The Honorable Joseph F. Bataillon, United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

brief under <u>Anders v. California</u>, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), he argues that the sentence is unreasonable. Onumbu has filed a supplemental brief, in which he challenges the validity of his plea, and argues that he received ineffective assistance of counsel. For the reasons discussed below, each of these arguments is unavailing.

First, Onumbu's challenge to the voluntariness of his guilty plea is not cognizable in this direct appeal, because he did not move to withdraw his plea below. See United States v. Umanzor, 617 F.3d 1053, 1060 (8th Cir. 2010) (defendant may not challenge voluntariness of guilty plea for first time on direct appeal if he did not move to withdraw plea in district court). Second, his ineffective-assistance claims are more properly raised in proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, and we decline to consider those claims in this appeal. See United States v. McAdory, 501 F.3d 868, 872-73 (8th Cir. 2007) (ineffective-assistance claims are ordinarily deferred to § 2255 proceedings). Third, after careful review, we conclude that the sentence is not unreasonable. See United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (appellate review of sentencing decision).

Finally, having reviewed the record independently under <u>Penson v. Ohio</u>, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues. Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we affirm.
