

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

JEFFREY SAMUEL SNEED,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

No. 03-4053

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham.  
N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Chief District Judge.  
(CR-02-154)

Submitted: May 29, 2003

Decided: June 5, 2003

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Louis C. Allen, III, Federal Public Defender, John A. Dusenbury, Jr., Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Randall S. Galyon, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Jeffrey Sneed appeals his 82-month sentence imposed by the district court following his guilty plea to being a felon in possession of a firearm, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(2) (2000). Counsel has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Additionally, Sneed has filed a pro se supplemental brief. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

In counsel's *Anders* brief, Sneed contends the district court erred in calculating his sentencing guidelines' range. As Sneed raised no objection below, we review this claim for plain error. *United States v. General*, 278 F.3d 389, 394 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 536 U.S. 950 (2002). We find no error, plain or otherwise, in the district court's calculation of Sneed's guidelines' range.

In his pro se supplemental brief, Sneed argues the district court erred in determining his base offense level and that his Speedy Trial rights were violated. We find these arguments to be without merit. Pursuant to *Anders*, we have reviewed the record and find no error. Accordingly, we affirm Sneed's sentence. 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 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*