

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY JEROME TRAPP,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 01-4848

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington.
James C. Fox, Senior District Judge.
(CR-00-119-F)

Submitted: June 20, 2002

Decided: June 28, 2002

Before MICHAEL and KING, Circuit Judges, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Thomas P. McNamara, Federal Public Defender, G. Alan DuBois,
Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellant. Kimberly A. Moore, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES
ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Jerome Trapp appeals the district court's order revoking his term of supervised release and sentencing him to twenty-four months' imprisonment. Trapp's attorney has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising one issue but stating that, in his view, there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Trapp was informed of his opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not done so. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

Trapp claims that the district court abused its discretion in imposing a twenty-four month sentence because it exceeded the recommended sentencing range of six to twelve months set out in *U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual* ("USSG") § 7B1.4(a) (2000). We review the reasonableness of a revocation sentence for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Davis*, 53 F.3d 638, 642-43 (4th Cir. 1995). Based on our review of the record, we find the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Trapp to the statutory maximum sentence of twenty-four months' imprisonment. The sentencing ranges contained in Chapter Seven of the Guidelines are "non-binding, advisory guides to district courts in supervised release revocation proceedings." *Davis*, 53 F.3d at 642; *see also United States v. Holmes*, F.3d ___, 2002 WL 441198, *1 (8th Cir. Mar. 22, 2002).

As required by *Anders*, we have examined the entire record and find no other meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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