

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 00-4272

JOSEPH L. COOK, JR.,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
William M. Nickerson, District Judge.
(CR-99-336-WMN)

Submitted: September 14, 2000

Decided: October 6, 2000

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

James Wyda, Federal Public Defender, Denise C. Barrett, Assistant
Federal Public Defender, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant. Lynne
A. Battaglia, United States Attorney, Kathleen O. Gavin, Assistant
United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See
Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Joseph L. Cook, Jr., was convicted by a jury of obstruction of mail by a postal employee, in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 1703(a) (West Supp. 2000). He appeals his conviction and sentence. Cook's attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising one issue but stating that, in her view, there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Cook was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but he did not file such a brief. Because we find the assignment of error to lack merit and discern no other error in the record, we affirm Cook's conviction and sentence.

Counsel raises as a potential error the district court's denial of defense challenges for cause against two jurors who were government employees. We review the denial of a challenge for cause for abuse of discretion. See United States v. Capers, 61 F.3d 1100, 1104 (4th Cir. 1995). After a thorough review of the transcript of the voir dire proceedings, we find that the district court did not abuse its discretion in rejecting the challenges. See Dennis v. United States, 339 U.S. 162, 172 (1950). Moreover, even if we determined that the denial of the challenges was erroneous, reversal of Cook's conviction is not warranted. See United States v. Martinez-Salazar, ___ U.S. ___, 120 S. Ct. 774 (2000).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Cook's conviction and sentence. We deny counsel's motion to withdraw at this time. This court requires that counsel inform her client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED