

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-4460

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JACQUELINE LYNNE BRIDGES,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, Senior District Judge. (1:05-cr-00244-WLO)

Submitted: November 15, 2006

Decided: November 20, 2006

Before WIDENER, WILKINSON, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas N. Cochran, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Sandra Jane Hairston, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jacqueline Lynne Bridges appeals from the 160-month sentence imposed following her guilty plea to conspiracy to distribute more than fifty grams of crack cocaine. Bridges' counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967), stating that there were no meritorious issues for appeal, but addressing the validity of Bridges' sentence. Bridges filed two documents in this court, raising additional issues and expressing her disagreement with some drug amounts attributed to her. Because our review of the record discloses no reversible error, we affirm.

We find that Bridges' guilty plea was knowingly and voluntarily entered after a thorough hearing pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 11. Bridges was properly advised of her rights, the offense charged, and the minimum and maximum sentences for the offense. The court also determined that there was an independent factual basis for the plea and that the plea was not coerced or influenced by any promises. See North Carolina v. Alford, 400 U.S. 25, 31 (1970); United States v. DeFusco, 949 F.2d 114, 119-20 (4th Cir. 1991).

We find that the district court properly applied the Sentencing Guidelines and considered the relevant sentencing factors before imposing the 160-month sentence. 18 U.S.C.A. § 3553(a) (West 2000 & Supp. 2006); see United States v. Hughes,

401 F.3d 540, 546-47 (4th Cir. 2005). Additionally, we find that the sentence imposed was reasonable. See United States v. Green, 436 F.3d 449, 457 (4th Cir. 2006) (“[A] sentence imposed within the properly calculated [g]uidelines range . . . is presumptively reasonable.”) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 2309 (2006). Accordingly, we affirm Bridges’ sentence.

As required by Anders, we have reviewed the entire record, including the documents filed by Bridges, and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Bridges’ 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. Accordingly, we deny counsel’s motion to withdraw from representation. If Bridges requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move again 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