## United States Court of Appeals

For the Eighth Circu	ıít
No. 17-2197	
United States of Amer	rica
Plaintiff - A	1ppellee
v.	
Michael A. Sheehar	1
Defendant - 2	Appellant
Appeal from United States District of Missour	
Submitted: January 26, Filed: February 14, 20 [Unpublished]	
Before BENTON, MURPHY, and ERICKSON, Ci	rcuit Judges.
PER CURIAM.	
Michael Sheehan directly appeals after he possession of a firearm, and the district court <sup>1</sup> ser	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable M. Douglas Harpool, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

criminal. His counsel has moved for leave to withdraw, and has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), questioning the reasonableness of Sheehan's sentence, but conceding that an appeal waiver in the plea agreement is applicable.

We conclude that the appeal waiver is enforceable. See United States v. Scott, 627 F.3d 702, 704 (8th Cir. 2010) (de novo review of validity and applicability of appeal waiver). Sheehan concedes that he entered into the plea agreement and the appeal waiver knowingly and voluntarily, the arguments on appeal fall within the scope of the waiver, and no miscarriage of justice would result from enforcing the waiver. See United States v. Andis, 333 F.3d 886, 889-92 (8th Cir. 2003) (en banc). In addition, having independently reviewed the record under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we find no non-frivolous issues for appeal outside the scope of the waiver. Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we dismiss this appeal.

-2-