## United States Court of Appeals

For the Eighth Circuit

No. 20-2636
United States of America
Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Vonzel E. Rayford

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri - Springfield

Submitted: January 19, 2021 Filed: January 22, 2021 [Unpublished]

\_\_\_\_\_

Before KELLY, MELLOY, and GRASZ, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM.

Vonzel Rayford appeals the sentence the district court<sup>1</sup> imposed after he pleaded guilty to a firearm offense. His counsel has moved to withdraw, and has filed

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Beth Phillips, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri.

a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the calculation of Rayford's criminal history and the substantive reasonableness of his sentence.

We conclude that the district court did not clearly err in adding 3 points to Rayford's criminal history based on his 2000 federal conviction. See United States v. Townsend, 408 F.3d 1020, 1022 (8th Cir. 2005) (standards of review); see also U.S.S.G. §§ 4A1.2(e)(1) (for computing criminal history, any prior prison sentence exceeding 1 year and 1 month that resulted in defendant being incarcerated within 15 years of defendant's commencement of instant offense is counted); 4A1.2(k)(2) (relevant time period for calculation is date of release from incarceration resulting from revocation of, inter alia, supervised release). We further conclude that the district court did not impose an unreasonable sentence, as the court properly considered the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a); and there is no indication the court considered an improper or irrelevant factor, or committed a clear error in weighing relevant factors. See United States v. Salazar-Aleman, 741 F.3d 878, 881 (8th Cir. 2013) (discussing appellate review of sentencing decisions).

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

\_\_\_\_\_