

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-4870

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

VICTOR MANUEL CASTILLO,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 96-4874

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SALVADOR VILLANEUVA,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (CR-96-305)

Submitted: May 29, 1997

Decided: June 13, 1997

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Bruce Betts, Columbia, South Carolina; Parks N. Small, Federal Public Defender, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellants. Kelly Elizabeth Shackelford, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Victor M. Castillo and Salvador Villaneuva appeal from their convictions and sentences imposed for conspiracy to possess marijuana with intent to distribute. We affirm.

Appellants' attorneys have filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), concluding that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal, but raising the issues of whether the district court complied with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 when it accepted the Appellants' guilty pleas and whether it properly applied the United States Sentencing Guidelines to the factual findings made at sentencing. Our review of the record reveals that the district court was in compliance with Rule 11 and properly applied the Sentencing Guidelines in its imposition of sentence. Pursuant to Anders, this court has reviewed the record for potential error and has found none. Accordingly, we affirm.

This Court requires that counsel inform their clients, in writing, of their right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the clients request that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move this Court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsels' motion must state that a copy thereof was served on their clients. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the mate-

rials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED