United States Court of Appeals

For the Fighth Circuit

~	y or the Cighth Cirruit	
	No. 19-1307	
Uı	nited States of America	
	Plaintiff - Appellee	
	v.	
Eduv	wijes Cervantes-Mendoza	
	Defendant - Appella	nt
	om United States District Con District of Arkansas - Fay	
	omitted: August 22, 2019 Filed: August 27, 2019 [Unpublished]	
Before COLLOTON, ERICKS	ON, and GRASZ, Circuit Ju	udges.
PER CURIAM.		
Eduwijes Cervantes-Mer and the district court ¹ sentenced	ndoza appeals after he pled	

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

Guidelines Manual range. His counsel has moved to withdraw, and has filed a brief under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing the district court erred by holding Cervantes-Mendoza accountable for methamphetamine seized from a co-conspirator's vehicle, and the district court imposed a substantively unreasonable sentence.

First, we conclude the district court did not clearly err in holding Cervantes-Mendoza accountable for methamphetamine seized from a co-conspirator's vehicle. See U.S.S.G. § 1B1.3(a)(1)(B) (noting in cases of jointly undertaken criminal activity in concert with others, a defendant is responsible for conduct (1) within scope of the activity, (2) in furtherance of the activity, and (3) reasonably foreseeable); see also United States v. Adejumo, 772 F.3d 513, 533 (8th Cir. 2014) (reviewing for clear error district court's findings as to the scope, furtherance, and foreseeability). Second, we conclude the district court did not impose a substantively unreasonable sentence. 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). In addition, having independently reviewed the record under 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.

-2-