UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-4567

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DANTE EUGENE TOWNSEND,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, Chief District Judge. (1:25-cr-00011-CCE-1)

Submitted: August 20, 2026 Decided: August 24, 2026

Before AGEE and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Eric D. Placke, Federal Public Defender, Kathleen A. Gleason, First Assistant Federal Public Defender, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Julie Carol Niemeier, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dante Eugene Townsend pleaded guilty to possession of a machine gun, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(o), and the district court sentenced him to 39 months' imprisonment. On appeal, 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 Townsend's sentence. Although informed of his right to do so, Townsend has not filed a pro se supplemental brief, and the Government has elected not to file a brief.

We review "all sentences—whether inside, just outside, or significantly outside the Guidelines range—under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard." *United States v. Torres-Reyes*, 952 F.3d 147, 151 (4th Cir. 2020) (internal quotation marks omitted). In conducting this review, we must first ensure that the sentence is procedurally reasonable, "consider[ing] whether the district court properly calculated the defendant's advisory [Sentencing G]uidelines range, gave the parties an opportunity to argue for an appropriate sentence, considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, and sufficiently explained the selected sentence." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). If the sentence is free of "significant procedural error," we then review it for substantive reasonableness, "tak[ing] into account the totality of the circumstances, including the extent of any variance from the Guidelines range." *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). A sentence must be "sufficient, but not greater than necessary," to satisfy the statutory purposes of sentencing. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

Here, the district court correctly calculated Townsend's advisory Guidelines range, heard argument from the parties, provided Townsend an opportunity to allocute, considered

the § 3553(a) sentencing factors, and explained its reasons for imposing the chosen sentence. Based on these proceedings and the factors identified by the district court, we conclude that Townsend's sentence is both procedurally and substantively reasonable. In accordance with *Anders*, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious grounds for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment.

This court requires that counsel inform Townsend, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Townsend 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 Townsend. 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