

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-4424

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DELLA RAYN LOCKLEAR,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, Chief District Judge. (1:16-cr-00082-TDS-1)

Submitted: February 15, 2018

Decided: February 16, 2018

Before WILKINSON, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lisa S. Costner, LISA S. COSTNER, P.A., Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Terry Michael Meinecke, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Della Rayn Locklear pleaded guilty to carjacking resulting in death, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2119(3) (2012), and the district court sentenced her to 259 months in prison. On appeal, Locklear's counsel has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), certifying that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal. Locklear was notified of her right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has not done so. We affirm.

In accordance with *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in this case and have found no meritorious grounds for appeal. Before accepting Locklear's guilty plea, the district court conducted a thorough plea colloquy, satisfying the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11, and ensuring that Locklear's plea was knowing, voluntary, and supported by an independent factual basis. *See United States v. DeFusco*, 949 F.2d 114, 116, 119-20 (4th Cir. 1991). The district court made no significant procedural error at sentencing, *see Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007), and Locklear does not rebut our appellate presumption that her sentence is substantively reasonable. *See United States v. Louthian*, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir. 2014).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Locklear, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Locklear 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 Locklear.

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