

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-4494

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JAMMIE C. REID,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District Judge. (6:04-cr-01009-HMH)

Submitted: November 6, 2007

Decided: December 4, 2007

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David W. Plowden, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. William Corley Lucius, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jammie C. Reid appeals the district court's order revoking his supervised probation and sentencing him to nine months' imprisonment. Counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting there are no non-frivolous grounds for appeal but questioning whether the sentence imposed was reasonable. Reid was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but has not done so.

We have reviewed the record and conclude that Reid's sentence is within the advisory guidelines range and well below the statutory maximum sentence, and thus the district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing a nine-month term of imprisonment. The district court's revocation proceedings otherwise comport with due process. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583 (2000). Finding no error, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

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