

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-4484

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANDRES ESTRADA,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 06-4804

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

PRIMITIVO ABEJA VEGA, a/k/a Roberto Lopez,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. James A. Beaty, Jr., Chief District Judge. (1:05-cr-00363-JAB)

Submitted: July 11, 2007

Decided: July 20, 2007

Before MOTZ and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John A. Dusenbury, Jr., OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Greensboro, North Carolina; Benjamin D. Porter, MORROW, ALEXANDER & PORTER, PLLC, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellants. Anna Mills Wagoner, United States Attorney, Randall Stuart Galyon, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Andres Estrada and Primitivo Abeja Vega appeal their convictions and sentences for conspiracy to distribute 500 grams or more of methamphetamine in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (2000). On appeal, counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), claiming there are no meritorious issues on appeal, but raising the question of whether the sentences were reasonable. Neither Appellant filed a pro se supplemental brief. Finding no error, we affirm.

We find Appellants' ranges of imprisonment were properly calculated under the Sentencing Guidelines. Thus, their sentences at the low end of the Guidelines range of imprisonment were reasonable. United States v. Johnson, 445 F.3d 339, 341 (4th Cir. 2006).

Pursuant to Anders, we have examined the entire record and find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the convictions and sentences. We require counsel to inform the clients, in writing, of their right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If a client requests a petition be filed, but counsel believes 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 in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED