

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-4297

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JASON MOON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. Joseph Robert Goodwin, Chief District Judge. (2:06-cr-00074)

Submitted: September 26, 2007

Decided: October 10, 2007

Before WILKINSON and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mary Lou Newberger, Federal Public Defender, Jonathan D. Byrne, Appellate Counsel, David R. Bungard, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellant. Steven Ian Loew, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jason Moon was found guilty of committing several Grade C violations of his supervised release and was sentenced to nine months of imprisonment and twenty-seven months of supervised release thereafter. On appeal, counsel has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), alleging that there are no meritorious claims on appeal but raising the following issue: whether the district court's sentence was erroneous. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

We do not find that Moon's sentence is plainly unreasonable. See United States v. Crudup, 461 F.3d 433, 437 (4th Cir. 2006), cert. denied, 127 S. Ct. 1813 (2007) (stating review standard). Moon was sentenced within a properly-calculated advisory sentencing range of three to nine months. See U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual ("USSG") § 7B1.4(a), p.s. (2006) (revocation table). Accordingly, we find no error in his sentence.

We have examined the entire record in this case in accordance with the requirements of Anders, and find no meritorious issues for appeal.* Accordingly, we affirm the revocation order and the sentence imposed. 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

*Moon was notified of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief but failed to do so.

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