

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-4712**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SHAPRIA CHAPMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Malcolm J. Howard, District Judge. (CR-03-20-HO)

---

Submitted: April 15, 2004

Decided: April 20, 2004

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Randolph M. Lee, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anne Margaret Hayes, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant Shapria Chapman pled guilty to one count of being a felon in possession of a firearm and one count of possessing a firearm with an obliterated serial number, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 922(k) and 924 (2000). He was sentenced to thirty months in prison.

Chapman's appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) raising two issues regarding Chapman's sentence: (1) whether the district court properly increased his offense level by four because of the number of firearms involved in Chapman's conduct; and (2) whether the district court erroneously enhanced Chapman's offense level by two for being a manager of criminal conduct. The Government has elected not to file a brief. Chapman was notified of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief and has not done so.

We have independently reviewed the entire record in this case, including the issues raised by counsel, and, in accordance with Anders, have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Chapman'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 adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED