

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-4484

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

REGEANA WRIGHT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Elkins. Robert E. Maxwell, Senior District Judge. (CR-03-15-REM)

Submitted: December 15, 2005

Decided: December 20, 2005

Before MICHAEL and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Timothy M. Sirk, Keyser, West Virginia, for Appellant. Stephen Donald Warner, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Elkins, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Regeana Wright appeals the 120-month concurrent sentences imposed after she pled guilty to conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute more than five grams of crack cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2000), and to interstate travel to promote a drug business, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1952(a)(3) (2000). Wright's counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging Wright's sentence but stating that, in his view, there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Wright was informed of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has not done so. We affirm.

Counsel asserts that, in light of the Supreme Court's decision in United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220 (2005), the 120-month statutory mandatory minimum sentence Wright received is too harsh. Wright's claim is foreclosed by our decision in United States v. Robinson, 404 F.3d 850, 862 (4th Cir.) ("Even . . . after Booker, . . . a district court has no discretion to impose a sentence outside of the statutory range established by Congress for the offense of conviction."), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 288 (2005).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record for any meritorious issues and have found none. Accordingly, we affirm Wright's conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of her 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