

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-4812**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MARCO ELDRICO PATTERSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (CR-02-471)

---

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Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Joshua S. Kendrick, DEBRA CHAPMAN, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Arthur B. Parham, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Marco Eldrico Patterson appeals his conviction pursuant to a guilty plea and ninety-eight month sentence for conspiracy to distribute cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2000). Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), in which he states there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but presenting two issues for our review. Although notified of his right to file a supplemental pro se brief, Patterson has not done so. Finding no error, we affirm.

First, Patterson argues that his guilty plea was not valid. Because Patterson did not object in the district court, our review is for plain error. United States v. Vonn, 535 U.S. 55, 59 (2002). We have reviewed the district court's thorough plea hearing and have found no error.

Patterson also contends that his sentence was unconstitutional. We have reviewed the record and disagree. In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm Patterson'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