

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-4726

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MICHAEL JAMES PATTERSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 00-4727

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MICHAEL JAMES PATTERSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg,
District Judge. (CR-99-43, CR-99-75)

Submitted: May 28, 2002

Decided: July 8, 2002

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

D. Rodney Kight, Jr., KIGHT LAW OFFICE, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellant. Thomas Richard Ascik, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Michael James Patterson brings a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel during his plea and sentencing on one count of unlawful possession of a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 922(g)(1) (West 2000) and one count of conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine and cocaine base in violation of 21 U.S.C.A. §§ 841(a)(1), 846 (West 1999 & Supp. 2001). Patterson's appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting there are no meritorious issues for appeal but addressing whether Patterson's counsel conclusively provided ineffective assistance of counsel at either Patterson's plea hearings or sentencing hearing and whether any other meritorious claims exist.* We have thoroughly reviewed the record and find no evidence on the face of the record that Patterson's attorney provided ineffective assistance of counsel at either his plea hearing or at sentencing.

We have examined the entire record in this case in accordance with the requirements of Anders and find no meritorious issues for appeal. 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

* Patterson was notified by counsel of his right to file a supplemental brief raising issues he deemed significant and has elected not to do so.

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. Finally, 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