

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

JEREMY DEMOND GOOLSBY,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 00-4910

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham.  
N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Chief District Judge.  
(CR-00-83)

Submitted: May 8, 2001

Decided: June 18, 2001

Before LUTTIG, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Louis C. Allen, III, Federal Public Defender, Gregory Davis, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Walter C. Holton, Jr., United States Attorney, Sandra J. Hairston, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

### OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Jeremy Demond Goolsby appeals the seventy-eight month sentence imposed by the district court following his guilty plea to distribution of crack cocaine in violation of 21 U.S.C.A. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(C) (West 1999). Goolsby's counsel has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Although Goolsby was informed of his right to file a supplemental brief, he has not done so. His attorney raises only one issue.

Goolsby contends the district court erred in determining the amount of drugs upon which Goolsby's sentence was based. This Court reviews for clear error the district court's factual finding concerning the amount of drugs attributable to a defendant for sentencing purposes. See *United States v. Randall*, 171 F.3d 195, 210 (4th Cir. 1999). Because Goolsby entered into a stipulation regarding the amount of drugs attributable to him, which the district court found to have a reasonable factual basis, we find the district court did not clearly err. See *United States v. Williams*, 29 F.3d 172, 174 (4th Cir. 1994); *United States v. Gilliam*, 987 F.2d 1009, 1013 (4th Cir. 1993).

Pursuant to *Anders*, this court has reviewed the record for reversible error and found none. We therefore affirm. We deny counsel's motion to withdraw at this time. 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 a petition be filed, but counsel believes 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*