

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-4634

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RONALD SHANE JOHNSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (4:13-cr-00152-RBH-1)

Submitted: February 19, 2015

Decided: March 3, 2015

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael A. Meetze, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellant. William E. Day, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

After finding that Ronald Shane Johnson had violated the terms of his supervised release, the district court revoked release and imposed an eight-month term of imprisonment. Johnson now appeals. His attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising two issues but concluding that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Johnson was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief but did not file such a brief. We affirm.

Johnson admitted committing four of the five charged release violations and did not contest the fifth. Accordingly, we conclude that the court did not clearly err when it found that he had violated the conditions of release. See United States v. Miller, 557 F.3d 910, 914 (4th Cir. 2009). Nor did the court abuse its discretion in deciding to revoke release. See United States v. Pregent, 190 F.3d 279, 282 (4th Cir. 1999).

Johnson's sentence falls below the statutory maximum of two years and within the policy statement range of five-twelve months. Further, the district court took the statutory sentencing factors into consideration when determining the sentence. Finally, the court provided sound grounds for selecting the sentence. We conclude that the sentence is not

plainly unreasonable. See United States v. Crudup, 461 F.3d 433, 439-40 (4th Cir. 2006).

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm. 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, counsel may then move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy of the motion 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