

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-7597

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

EDWARD WALTER BUCK,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Chief District Judge. (CR-05-133)

Submitted: March 23, 2006

Decided: March 29, 2006

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, John A. Dusenbury, Jr., Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Benjamin H. White, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Edward Walter Buck appeals the district court's order denying his motion for early termination of probation. On appeal, counsel filed an Anders* brief, in which he states there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Buck was informed of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not filed a brief. We affirm.

Our review of the record convinces us that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Buck's motion for early termination of probation. See 18 U.S.C. § 3564(c) (2000); United States v. Pregent, 190 F.3d 279, 282 (4th Cir. 1999) (reviewing denial of motion for early termination of supervised release for abuse of discretion). In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the judgment of the district court. This court requires that counsel inform Buck, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Buck 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 Buck.

*Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967).

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