UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-4457

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JIMMY LEE WILLIAMS, a/k/a Jimmy Lee Williamson, a/k/a J. J. Williamson, a/k/a Jimmy Williamson, a/k/a Jimmy C. Williamson, a/k/a Jimmy J. Williamson, a/k/a Jimmy L. Williamson, a/k/a Ayamawat Bidziil, a/k/a J. Edwards, a/k/a John Bruce, a/k/a Aaron Bruce,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. David C. Norton, District Judge. (3:15-cr-00073-DCN-DCK-1)

Submitted: August 27, 2026 Decided: August 31, 2026

Before KING, HEYTENS, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Chiege Ojugo Kalu Okwara, LAW OFFICE OF CHIEGE O. KALU OKWARA, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellant. Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In 2016, Jimmy Lee Williams pleaded guilty to two counts of conspiracy to defraud the United States, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, and money laundering, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956. The district court sentenced Williams to 105 months' imprisonment, followed by three years' supervised release. Williams now appeals. In 2023, the court revoked Williams' supervision based on new criminal conduct involving fraud. The court sentenced Williams to 24 months' imprisonment, following by one year of supervised release. In 2024, Williams again committed new criminal conduct involving fraud. The district court revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to 24 months' imprisonment with no additional term of supervised release. Williams now appeals.

On appeal, Williams's counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning the reasonableness of Williams's sentence. Although notified of his right to do so, Williams has not filed a pro se supplemental brief. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

"A district court has broad discretion when imposing a sentence upon revocation of supervised release." *United States v. Patterson*, 957 F.3d 426, 436 (4th Cir. 2020). We "will affirm a revocation sentence if it is within the statutory maximum and is not plainly unreasonable." *Id.* Where, as here, the sentence does not exceed the statutory maximum, we "first examine whether the sentence was unreasonable at all, procedurally or substantively." *United States v. Amin*, 85 F.4th 727, 739 (4th Cir. 2023) (internal quotation

marks omitted). "Only if we find the sentence unreasonable must we decide whether it is plainly so." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A revocation sentence is procedurally reasonable if the district court adequately explains the chosen sentence after considering the Sentencing Guidelines' nonbinding Chapter Seven policy statements and the applicable 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors." *United States v. Coston*, 964 F.3d 289, 297 (4th Cir. 2020) (internal quotation marks omitted). "A revocation sentence is substantively reasonable if, in light of the totality of the circumstances, the court states an appropriate basis for concluding that the defendant should receive the sentence imposed." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

Here, the district court correctly calculated the policy statement range and the statutory maximum, afforded the parties an opportunity to argue for an appropriate sentence, and adequately explained its chosen sentence. Specifically, the court emphasized Williams's extensive criminal history spanning more than four decades, his repeated violations of supervised release, and the need to deter him from future criminal conduct and protect the public. Although the court acknowledged Williams's mental health history and recent treatment efforts, it concluded that those mitigating factors were outweighed by the fact that prior terms of imprisonment and supervision had failed to deter his continued criminal conduct. Based on our review of the record, we conclude that Williams's revocation sentence is procedurally reasonable. In addition, we discern nothing in the record to rebut the presumption of substantive reasonableness afforded to Williams's below-policy-statement-range sentence. *See United States v. Gibbs*, 897 F.3d 199, 204 (4th Cir. 2018).

In accordance with *Anders*, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm Williams's revocation judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Williams, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Williams 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 Williams.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED