

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-4435

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

LORD JUSTICE SUPREME, a/k/a John Earl Graham,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (CR-00-506)

Submitted: December 7, 2001

Decided: December 19, 2001

Before WIDENER, WILKINS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William F. Nettles, IV, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellant. Stacey Denise Haynes, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Lord Justice Supreme appeals from his conviction and sentence to seventy months in prison and three years of supervised release following his guilty plea to one count of making a false statement in connection with the attempted purchase of a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 922(a)(6), 924(a)(2) (West 2000). Supreme's attorney filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1976), raising the issue of compliance with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11, but stating that, in his view, there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Supreme filed a supplemental pro se brief arguing he did not intend to violate the law and that a mental defect prevented him from understanding the judicial process.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Supreme's conviction and sentence. 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 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