

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-4376**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DANIEL ROBERT HUNSBERGER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:10-cr-00297-NCT-1)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2012

Decided: February 16, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Milton Bays Shoaf, ADDISON & SHOAF, Salisbury, North Carolina, for Appellant. Anand P. Ramaswamy, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Robert Hunsberger pled guilty to one count of possession of child pornography in violation of 18 U.S.C.A. § 2252A(a)(5)(B) (West Supp. 2011), and was sentenced within the advisory Guidelines range to a term of ninety-seven months' incarceration. Hunsberger appealed, and counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that in his view there are no meritorious issues for appeal and alleging no error by the district court, but questioning whether, by operation of enhancements contained in USSG § 2G2.2, Hunsberger's sentence was unduly severe under the circumstances. Hunsberger was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief but has not done so.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record and conclude that Hunsberger's claim is without merit, and that his sentence is not procedurally unreasonable. See United States v. Morace, 594 F.3d 340, 346-51 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 131 S. Ct. 307 (2010). Additionally, in accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We therefore affirm the district court's judgment. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client 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 the client. Finally, 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