

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-4265

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANTHONY LAMB,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (4:02-cr-00058-RGD)

Submitted: October 17, 2006

Decided: October 19, 2006

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael S. Nachmanoff, Acting Federal Public Defender, Walter B. Dalton, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellant. Scott Walker Putney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Lamb appeals his twenty-month term of imprisonment imposed after the district court revoked his supervised release. Lamb's attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 739 (1967), raising the argument that the sentence was not reasonable, but stating that he finds no meritorious grounds for appeal. The Government did not file an answering brief, and although advised of his right to do so, Lamb did not file a pro se supplemental brief.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Pursuant to United States v. Crudup, ___ F.3d ___, ___, 2006 WL 2243586, at *3 (4th Cir. Aug. 7, 2006), revocation sentences are reviewed to determine whether they are "plainly unreasonable" with regard to the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2000) factors applicable to these sentences. We find that Lamb's sentence is not plainly unreasonable because the district court sentenced Lamb within the statutory maximum and sufficiently stated a proper basis for its conclusion that Lamb should be sentenced to a lengthier sentence than one within the advisory range. We therefore affirm Lamb's conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform Lamb, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Lamb 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 Lamb.

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