

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-4978

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRAVIS DARRELL HAYNES,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.
(4:11-cr-00079-RBH-4)

Submitted: June 4, 2012

Decided: June 12, 2012

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William W. Watkins, Sr., WILLIAM W. WATKINS, P.A., Columbia,
South Carolina, for Appellant. 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Travis Darrell Haynes pleaded guilty, pursuant to a written plea agreement, to two counts of use and carry of a firearm during and in relation to, and in furtherance of, a crime of violence, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c)(1)(A), 2 (2006). Haynes was sentenced to consecutive terms of imprisonment of eighty-four and 300 months followed by concurrent five-year terms of supervised release. On appeal, Haynes' counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), in which he states that he can find no meritorious issues for appeal. Counsel requests our review of the district court's compliance with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 and the reasonableness of Haynes' sentence. Haynes filed a pro se supplemental brief in which he contends that his sentences constitute multiple punishments for the same offense.

Our review of the plea hearing transcript uncovers no violation of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11. Nor do we find Haynes' sentences to be unreasonable. The imposition of a sentence at no greater than the statutorily-mandated minimum term is per se reasonable. United States v. Farrior, 535 F.3d 210, 224 (4th Cir. 2008). Haynes' sentences were both within-Guidelines and the minimum sentences permitted by statute. The consecutive nature of Haynes' custodial sentences was likewise mandated by statute. 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(D)(ii) (2006). Haynes' pro se

double jeopardy argument also fails. Although he was convicted twice under the same statute of conviction, he has not been punished twice for the same offense. His convictions arose from distinct offenses – the brandishing of firearms during robberies of different gas stations on different days. Thus, we find no error.

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

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