

UNPUBLISHED

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

DORIAN JORDAN, a/k/a K.K., a/k/a
Kevin,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 03-4091

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston.
Joseph Robert Goodwin, District Judge.
(CR-01-25)

Submitted: May 12, 2003

Decided: May 29, 2003

Before NIEMEYER and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Mary Lou Newberger, Federal Public Defender, David R. Bungard,
Assistant Federal Public Defender, Charleston, West Virginia, for
Appellant. Kasey Warner, United States Attorney, John J. Frail,
Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Dorian Jordan appeals his twelve-month sentence imposed by the district court following his violation of the terms of his supervised release. In a brief filed pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Jordan's attorney challenges the length of Jordan's revocation sentence. Jordan was apprised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has not done so. We affirm.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record on appeal, including the nature and extent of Jordan's violations of his supervised release and the transcript of the revocation hearing. We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in revoking Jordan's supervised release based on his admissions at the revocation hearing. *See United States v. Davis*, 53 F.3d 638, 642-43 (4th Cir. 1995). Because the district court was presented with and explicitly considered the suggested sentencing range of U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 7B1.4 (2002), and the statutory maximum sentence of 18 U.S.C. § 3583 (2000), we find no error in Jordan's sentence. *Id.* at 642-43.

As required by *Anders*, we have examined the entire record and find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm Jordan's sentence. Further, 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