

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-5160

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANTWON MICHAEL QUARLES, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District Judge. (6:06-cr-00520-HMH)

Submitted: June 15, 2007

Decided: June 19, 2007

Before WIDENER, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David W. Plowden, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. Elizabeth Jean Howard, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antwon M. Quarles pled guilty to bank robbery and was sentenced to fifty-seven months imprisonment, a sentence within the statutory maximum and at the low end of the sentencing guidelines range. Quarles appealed, and counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), contending that there were no meritorious issues for appeal but seeking review of Quarles' sentence. Although informed of his right to do so, Quarles has not filed a pro se supplemental brief.

At sentencing, the district court considered the properly calculated advisory guideline range and the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C.A. § 3553(a) (West 2000 & Supp. 2006). Quarles did not object to his sentence or the calculation of the guideline range below, and he provides no reason to determine that his sentence is unreasonable. Accordingly, we conclude that there was no sentencing error and that Quarles' sentence is reasonable. See United States v. Green, 436 F.3d 449, 457 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 2309 (2006).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Quarles' conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform Quarles, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Quarles 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 Quarles.

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