United States Court of Appeals

	For the Eighth Circuit	
	No. 18-1175	
Ţ	United States of America	
	Plaintiff - Appellee	
	v.	
	Peng Chanthalangsy	
	Defendant - Appellant	
	rom United States District Court ern District of Arkansas - Fayetteville	
Su	bmitted: August 16, 2018 Filed: August 27, 2018 [Unpublished]	
Before WOLLMAN, GRUEN	IDER, and GRASZ, Circuit Judges.	
PER CURIAM.		
	rectly appeals the within-Guidelines-range senter after he pled guilty to a child-pornography charge.	

¹The Honorable Timothy L. Brooks, United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

counsel has moved to withdraw and has filed a brief under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing that Chanthalangsy's sentence is substantively unreasonable, as the district court gave too much weight to certain statements in the presentence report regarding the means by which Chanthalangsy accessed child pornography.

After careful consideration, we conclude that Chanthalangsy—by withdrawing his objections to the presentence report at sentencing—waived any claim of error concerning the district court's adoption of the relevant statements of facts in the presentence report. *Cf. United States v. White*, 447 F.3d 1029, 1032 (8th Cir. 2006) (noting that the defendant, by acknowledging that the facts set forth in the presentence report were correct, effectively withdrew his objections to those facts and thereby waived his right to argue his objections on appeal). We further conclude that Chanthalangsy's sentence is not substantively unreasonable. *See United States v. Feemster*, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (reviewing sentence under deferential abuse-of-discretion standard and discussing substantive reasonableness).

Having independently reviewed the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues for appeal. Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we affirm.