

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-4500

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTONIO R. WOODS, a/k/a Toby,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (3:18-cr-00418-MGL-1)

Submitted: April 16, 2020

Decided: April 16, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hannah Rogers Metcalfe, METCALFE & ATKINSON, LLC, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. Benjamin Neale Garner, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antonio R. Woods pled guilty, pursuant to a written plea agreement, to possession with intent to distribute and distribution of cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(C) (2018). The district court sentenced Woods to 151 months' imprisonment. On appeal, Woods argues that the district court erred in designating him a career offender and in assigning a two-level enhancement to his offense level for maintaining a "stash house" under U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 2D1.1(C)(2) (2018). The Government has moved to dismiss the appeal as barred by Woods' waiver of the right to appeal included in his plea agreement.

An appeal waiver "preclude[s] a defendant from appealing a specific issue if the record establishes that the waiver is valid and the issue being appealed is within the scope of the waiver." *United States v. Archie*, 771 F.3d 217, 221 (4th Cir. 2014). A defendant validly waives his appeal rights if he agreed to the waiver "knowingly and intelligently." *United States v. Manigan*, 592 F.3d 621, 627 (4th Cir. 2010). "To determine whether a waiver is knowing and intelligent, we examine the totality of the circumstances, including the experience and conduct of the accused, as well as the accused's educational background and familiarity with the terms of the plea agreement." *United States v. Thornsbury*, 670 F.3d 532, 537 (4th Cir. 2012) (internal quotation marks omitted). "Generally, if a district court questions a defendant regarding the waiver of appellate rights during the [Fed. R. Crim. P.] 11 colloquy and the record indicates that the defendant understood the full significance of the waiver, the waiver is valid." *Id.*

Our review of the Rule 11 colloquy and the plea agreement confirms that Woods knowingly and voluntarily waived the right to appeal his sentence and that his claims fall squarely within the scope of the waiver. We therefore enforce the appellate waiver and grant the Government's motion to dismiss the appeal. 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.

DISMISSED