

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-4407**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

GREGORY PETER HANSEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge. (CR-01-90)

---

Submitted: December 11, 2003

Decided: December 19, 2003

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Andrew B. Banzhoff, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellant. Jerry Wayne Miller, Thomas Richard Ascik, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Gregory Peter Hansen pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to three counts of bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2113(a)(2000). He was sentenced to 135 months in prison.

Hansen's appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising only the issue of whether Hansen received ineffective assistance of counsel in relation to his guilty plea and stating that, in his view, there are no meritorious grounds for appeal.\* Though notified of his opportunity to do so, Hansen did not file a pro se supplemental brief.

In addition to the one issue raised by appellate counsel, pursuant to Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and find no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Hansen's convictions 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

---

\* The Government has elected not to file a brief.

adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED