

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-4268**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARIANA SIMEONOV,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (4:07-cr-00479-RBH-10)

---

Submitted: April 16, 2009

Decided: April 24, 2009

---

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John M. Ervin, III, ERVIN LAW OFFICE, Darlington, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Pursuant to a written plea agreement, Mariana Simeonov was convicted of conspiracy to commit marriage fraud, 18 U.S.C. § 371 (2006), and was sentenced to fifteen months in prison. She now appeals. Her attorney has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), questioning whether the district court complied with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 but concluding that it did. Simeonov was advised of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief but did not file such a brief.

After reviewing the transcript of Simeonov's Rule 11 proceeding, we find that the district court fully complied with Rule 11. Further, after a thorough examination of the record in accordance with Anders, we find that there are no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm.

This court requires counsel to 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, counsel may 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 significantly aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED