

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-3039**September Term, 2016****1:00-cr-00377-TFH-1****Filed On:** November 18, 2016

United States of America,

Appellee

v.

Alexander Otis Matthews,

Appellant

**ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

BEFORE: Brown, Griffith, and Kavanaugh, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the briefs filed by the parties, including appellant's supplement. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's May 27, 2015 order be affirmed. This is not an extraordinary case warranting coram nobis relief. United States v. Denedo, 556 U.S. 904, 911 (2009). Appellant has not shown that the alleged Rule 11 violations affected his substantial rights, see In re Sealed Case, 670 F.3d 1296, 1302 (D.C. Cir. 2011), or that his attorney's performance was deficient and he was prejudiced thereby, see Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

By:

/s/

Ken Meadows
Deputy Clerk