

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

JOSEPH ROPER, JR.,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 00-4611

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.  
C. Weston Houck, District Judge.  
(CR-99-227)

Submitted: May 22, 2001

Decided: June 11, 2001

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

William R. Williams, WILLCOX, BUYCK & WILLIAMS, P.A.,  
Florence, South Carolina, for Appellant. John C. Keeney, Acting  
Assistant Attorney General, Joshua R. Hochberg, Chief, Philip Urof-  
sky, Senior Trial Attorney, Fraud Section, Criminal Division, J. Rene  
Josey, United States Attorney, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT  
OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

Joseph Roper, Jr., was found guilty of Counts 1-18 of the superseding indictment, for conspiracy to commit mail fraud, mail fraud, and conspiracy to commit money laundering, and guilty of Counts 42-48, money laundering. For Counts 1-17 Roper was sentenced to sixty months each and for Counts 18, 42-48 to 135 months each, with all sentences to run concurrently. Roper's counsel has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising two issues but stating that in his opinion there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Roper raises the same issues in his pro se supplemental brief. For the reasons that follow we affirm.

First, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, we find that any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the conspiracy convictions beyond a reasonable doubt. *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 80 (1942). Second, we do not find that the district court clearly erred by increasing Roper's offense level by four for being a leader or organizer under *U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual* § 3B1.1 (1998). *United States v. France*, 164 F.3d 203, 209 (4th Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, 527 U.S. 1010 (1999).

Having examined the entire record in this case in accordance with the requirements of *Anders*, we find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm. This court requires that counsel inform his 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*