UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-4032

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff – Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY WAITER WILLIAMS, a/k/a Tone, a/k/a Tony, a/k/a Anthony Walter Williams,

Defendant – Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Richard E. Myers II, Chief District Judge. (5:21-cr-00237-M)

Submitted: May 27, 2026 Decided: August 18, 2026

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Mitchell G. Styers, BANZET, THOMPSON, STYERS & MAY, PLLC, Warrenton, North Carolina, for Appellant. W. Ellis Boyle, United States Attorney, Lucy Partain Brown, Assistant United States Attorney, Jake D. Pugh, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

A jury convicted Anthony Waiter Williams on two counts: conspiring to distribute and to possess with intent to distribute five kilograms or more of cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) and 846; and possessing with intent to distribute 500 grams or more of cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1). The advisory Guidelines range was life imprisonment. The district court varied downward and sentenced Williams to 360 months on each count, to run concurrently.

Williams raises five claims of error. He argues that the district court (1) admitted, in violation of Federal Rule of Evidence 410, statements he made during his post-arrest and proffer interviews; (2) abused its discretion in denying a mistrial after the jury heard an audio clip in which an agent's question referred to his prior federal imprisonment; (3) denied his motion for a judgment of acquittal on the conspiracy count despite insufficient evidence of an agreement; (4) denied him a hearing under *Franks v. Delaware*, 438 U.S. 154 (1978); and (5) imposed a procedurally and substantively unreasonable sentence. We have reviewed the record and briefs filed by the parties and find that no reversible error was committed.[*] We therefore affirm Williams's conviction and sentence.

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 decision process.

AFFIRMED

[*] We deny Williams's request to file a pro se brief while represented on appeal. *See United States v. Williams*, 5 F.4th 500, 511 n.7 (4th Cir. 2021)