

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-5870**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

AGNES PATRICIA DIXON, a/k/a Pat Dixon,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (CR-95-463)

---

Submitted: July 23, 1996

Decided: August 2, 1996

---

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Langdon D. Long, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. William Earl Day, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Agnes Patricia Dixon pled guilty to two counts of a nineteen-count indictment charging Dixon with conspiracy and substantive violations of 18 U.S.C.A. § 1014 (West 1976 and Supp. 1996) and 18 U.S.C.A. § 215(a)(1), (2) (West 1969). The district court sentenced Dixon to serve fourteen months imprisonment followed by five years of supervised release and to pay a special assessment fee of \$100. She appeals her convictions and sentence. Dixon's attorney has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), raising one issue but indicating that, in his view, there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Dixon was informed of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief, which she has failed to file.

Dixon's counsel raises the question of whether the district court complied with requirements outlined in Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure when taking Dixon's plea. Following a de novo review of the entire record, we conclude that the district court complied with all the mandates of Rule 11 in accepting Dixon's guilty plea. We therefore affirm Dixon's conviction and sentence.

In accordance with the requirements of Anders, we have examined the entire record in this case and find no other meritorious issues for appeal. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of her 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