

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-5252

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ROMAIL LEACH,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (4:05-cr-00770-TLW)

Submitted: May 25, 2007

Decided July 5, 2007

Before WILLIAMS, Chief Judge, and MOTZ and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ray Coit Yarborough, Jr., Florence, South Carolina, for Appellant.
Reginald I. Lloyd, United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina,
Alfred William Walker Bethea, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney,
Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Romail Leach appeals his thirty-two year sentence imposed following his guilty plea and convictions for firearm offenses pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) (2000). His attorney filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Though notified of his opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief, Leach has not done so. The Government has declined to file a responding brief. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

Leach suggests that the district court erred by not fully complying with Fed. R. Crim P. 11 at the guilty plea hearing, pointing out subsections that the district court purportedly overlooked. Leach has never sought to withdraw his guilty plea, and we therefore review his allegations for plain error. See United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 525-26 (4th Cir. 2002). While the district court may not have read verbatim from the rule, the court nevertheless ensured that Leach fully understood the significance of his guilty plea and that the plea was knowing and voluntary. After questioning Leach about the charges, his attorney's services, the rights that he was giving up by pleading guilty, the advisory guidelines ranges, the maximum penalties, and relevant conduct, the court found Leach fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea. Any purported error was not material, did not affect Leach's substantial rights, and did not affect the fairness of the proceedings. See United States v. Olano, 507 U.S. 725, 731-32 (1993). The district court

satisfactorily complied with its Rule 11 obligations, and we therefore reject Leach's challenge to the integrity of his guilty plea.

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

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