

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-4164

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

VIREN MUNDRA, a/k/a Virendra Mundra,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron M. Currie, District Judge. (CR-02-456)

Submitted: October 15, 2003

Decided: November 25, 2003

Before MOTZ, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John H. Hare, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Anne Hunter Young, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Viren Mundra, a native of India, pled guilty by way of a written plea agreement before a magistrate judge to one count of criminal copyright infringement in violation of 17 U.S.C. § 506(a)(1) (2000), 18 U.S.C. § 2319(b)(1) (2000). The district court sentenced him to an eighteen-month term of imprisonment.

On appeal, Mundra's attorney filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that there are no meritorious issues presented but raising questions as to whether the magistrate judge fully complied with Fed. R. Crim P. 11 and whether the district court correctly sentenced Mundra in accordance with the sentencing guidelines. Mundra was notified by counsel of his right to file a supplemental brief and has done so.

We find the magistrate judge fully complied with the requirements of Rule 11. We further find that the district court correctly adopted the unopposed presentence report and correctly sentenced Mundra within the proper guidelines range. We reject the claims raised in Mundra's informal brief as unsupported and meritless.

We have examined the entire record in this case in accordance with the requirements of Anders and find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm Mundra's conviction and 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 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