

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-4092

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

DWAYNE MAURICE GREEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (3:03-cr-01011-CMC)

Submitted: June 21, 2007

Decided: June 27, 2007

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John H. Hare, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Anne Hunter Young, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dwayne M. Green appeals the district court's order affirming a magistrate judge's revocation of Green's supervised release and imposition of a ten-month term of imprisonment. Counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting there are no non-frivolous grounds for appeal, but questioning whether the magistrate judge abused its discretion in revoking Green's supervised release and whether the sentence imposed is plainly unreasonable. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

We have reviewed the record and conclude that the magistrate judge did not abuse his discretion in revoking Green's supervised release. We further find the sentence imposed by the magistrate judge, and affirmed by the district court, was not plainly unreasonable because it is below the statutory maximum sentence of one year and within the advisory guideline range of seven to thirteen months. See United States v. Crudup, 461 F.3d 433, 437 (4th Cir. 2006), cert. denied 127 S.Ct. 1813 (2007); 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3) (2000); U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 7B1.4(a) (2005).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the record and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Therefore, we affirm the judgment of the district court. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to

petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client 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 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