

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-4813

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DESSIE RUTH NELSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge.
(8:07-cr-00451-DKC-1)

Submitted: July 6, 2009

Decided: July 28, 2009

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and NIEMEYER and DUNCAN, Circuit
Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gary A. Ticknor, Elkridge, Maryland, for Appellant. Jonathan
Biran, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dessie Ruth Nelson pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to bribery and income tax evasion, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 201 (2006) and 26 U.S.C. § 7201 (2006). The district court sentenced Nelson to sixty months in prison. Nelson appealed. Nelson's counsel has filed a brief in accordance with Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Although advised of her right to file a supplemental pro se brief, Nelson has not done so. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

In the absence of a motion to withdraw a guilty plea in the district court, we review for plain error the adequacy of the guilty plea proceeding under Fed. R. Crim. P. 11. United States v. Martinez, 277 F.3d 517, 525 (4th Cir. 2002). Our examination of the record shows that the district court fully complied with the requirements of Rule 11. Further, Nelson's plea was knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entered, and supported by a factual basis.

A review of the sentencing transcript and the presentence investigation report reveals no error in sentencing. When determining a sentence, the district court must calculate the appropriate advisory guidelines range and consider it in conjunction with the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)

(2006). Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 128 S. Ct. 586, 596 (2007). Appellate review of a district court's imposition of a sentence, "whether inside, just outside, or significantly outside the Guidelines range," is for abuse of discretion. Id. at 591. The district court followed the necessary procedural steps in sentencing Nelson, appropriately treating the sentencing guidelines as advisory, properly calculating and considering the applicable guidelines range, performing an "individualized assessment" of the § 3553(a) factors to the facts of the case, and stating in open court the reasons for the sentence. United States v. Carter, 564 F.3d 325, 328 (4th Cir. 2009). Thus, the district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing the chosen sentence.

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

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