

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-4933

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JERMAUCIYAE RYSUAN ABRAM,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, Chief District Judge. (1:19-cr-00230-TDS-4)

Submitted: May 19, 2020

Decided: May 21, 2020

Before NIEMEYER, HARRIS, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Milton Bays Shoaf, Jr., Salisbury, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Jermauciyae Rysuan Abram pleaded guilty to Hobbs Act robbery and aiding and abetting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 1951(a) (2018), and brandishing a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence and aiding and abetting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 924(c)(1)(A)(ii) (2018), and was sentenced to 141 months' imprisonment. Abram's counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning whether Abram's sentence is procedurally and substantively reasonable. Abram has not filed a pro se supplemental brief after receiving notice of his right to do so.

We review criminal sentences for both procedural and substantive reasonableness “under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard.” *United States v. Lynn*, 912 F.3d 212, 216 (4th Cir.) (internal quotation marks omitted), *cert. denied*, 140 S. Ct. 86 (2019). “In determining procedural reasonableness, we consider, among other things, whether the court properly determined the Sentencing Guidelines range, considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) [(2018)] factors, and sufficiently explained the selected sentence.” *Id.* In reviewing a sentence for substantive reasonableness, “we examine the totality of the circumstances to see whether the sentencing court abused its discretion in concluding that the sentence it chose satisfied the standards set forth in § 3553(a).” *United States v. Arbaugh*, 951 F.3d 167, 176 (4th Cir. 2020) (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). Moreover, we apply a presumption of reasonableness to a sentence within a correctly calculated Guidelines range. *Id.* We have reviewed the record and conclude that the 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 Abram, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Abram 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 Abram.

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