

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-4026

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

CHATAN MAULTSBY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (CR-00-50)

Submitted: July 25, 2006

Decided: July 31, 2006

Before MOTZ, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas P. McNamara, Federal Public Defender, Stephen C. Gordon, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Chatan Maultsby appeals from the district court's order revoking his supervised release and sentencing him to twenty-four months of imprisonment. Maultsby's attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), representing that, in his view, there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but raising the issue of whether the district court erred in imposing Maultsby's sentence. Although he was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, Maultsby has not done so. Finding no meritorious issues and no error by the district court, we affirm the revocation order and the sentence imposed.

In light of Maultsby's admission that he violated the terms of his supervision, we find no error by the district court in revoking his supervised release. See 18 U.S.C.A. § 3583(e)(3) (West 2000 & Supp. 2005); United States v. Davis, 53 F.3d 638, 642-43 (4th Cir. 1995). Maultsby challenges the length of the sentence and supervised release term. The twenty-four-month term of incarceration imposed by the district court was within the advisory guideline range and was reasonable. See United States v. Green, 436 F.3d 449 (4th Cir. 2006) (No. 05-4270); 18 U.S.C.A. § 3583(e)(3) (West 2000 & Supp. 2005); U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 7B1.4(a). The twenty-four month term of supervised release imposed following the revocation sentence was within the

statutory maximum and was not "plainly unreasonable." 18 U.S.C. §§ 3583(b), (h); 3742(a)(4) (2000).

In accordance with Anders, we have independently reviewed the entire record and find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order revoking Maultsby's supervised release and imposing a twenty-four-month 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