

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 98-4306

WILLIAM VANDROSS,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston.  
Patrick Michael Duffy, District Judge.  
(CR-96-524)

Submitted: March 31, 1999

Decided: May 3, 1999

Before WIDENER and WILKINS, Circuit Judges, and  
PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Eduardo Kelvin Curry, CURRY, CURRY & COUNTS, Charleston,  
South Carolina, for Appellant. Miller Williams Shealy, Jr., OFFICE  
OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, South Caro-  
lina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

A jury convicted William Vandross (Vandross) of the following charges: one count of conspiracy to possess with the intent to distribute and to distribute crack cocaine and heroin, 21 U.S.C.A. § 846 (West Supp. 1998); one count of possession with the intent to distribute crack cocaine, 21 U.S.C.A. § 841(a)(1) (West 1981); five counts of distribution of crack cocaine, 21 U.S.C.A. § 841(a)(1) (West 1981); one count of possession with the intent to distribute cocaine, crack cocaine, and heroin, 21 U.S.C.A. § 841(a)(1) (West 1981); one count of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, 18 U.S.C.A. § 922(g)(1) (West Supp. 1998); one count of conspiracy to use unauthorized telecommunication services, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1029 (West Supp. 1998); and one count of unauthorized use of telecommunications services, 18 U.S.C.A. § 1029(a)(5) (West Supp. 1998).

Counsel for Vandross has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel states that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but addresses the following issues: whether the district court clearly erred when it sentenced Vandross as an organizer or leader of the criminal activity; whether the district court clearly erred when it found that Vandross was more than minimally involved in the planning of the cellular phone cloning portion of the conspiracy; and whether the district court clearly erred when it enhanced Vandross' sentence for possessing a dangerous weapon during a narcotics offense. Vandross, informed of his right to file a supplemental brief, filed two briefs asserting several grounds for appeal.\*

We have examined the entire record in this case in accordance with

---

\*We grant Vandross' motion to file an addendum to his supplemental brief.

the requirements of Anders, and find no meritorious issues for appeal. We accordingly affirm Vandross' convictions 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 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