

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-5035**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DANIEL DAVID GUERRA DELGADO,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. James A. Beaty, Jr., Chief District Judge. (1:11-cr-00082-JAB-1)

---

Submitted: December 14, 2012

Decided: December 27, 2012

---

Before AGEE, DAVIS, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Carlyle Sherrill, III, SHERRILL & CAMERON, PLLC, Salisbury, North Carolina, for Appellant. Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Daniel David Guerra Delgado pleaded guilty to illegally reentering the United States after having previously been deported following a conviction for an aggravated felony, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a), (b)(2) (2006). The district court sentenced Delgado to forty-one months of imprisonment, and he now appeals. Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), questioning whether the sentence was reasonable. Although Delgado was informed of the right to file a supplemental pro se brief he has not done so. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

Counsel questions whether the sentence at the low end of the advisory Guidelines range was reasonable. We review a sentence for reasonableness, applying an abuse of discretion standard. Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007); see also United States v. Layton, 564 F.3d 330, 335 (4th Cir. 2009). In so doing, we examine the sentence for "significant procedural error," including "failing to calculate (or improperly calculating) the Guidelines range, treating the Guidelines as mandatory, failing to consider the [18 U.S.C.] § 3553(a) [(2006)] factors, selecting a sentence based on clearly erroneous facts, or failing to adequately explain the chosen sentence." Gall, 552 U.S. at 51. We will presume on appeal that a sentence within a properly calculated advisory Guidelines

range is reasonable. United States v. Allen, 491 F.3d 178, 193 (4th Cir. 2007); see Rita v. United States, 551 U.S. 338, 346-56 (2007) (upholding presumption of reasonableness for within-Guidelines sentence). We have thoroughly reviewed the record and conclude that the sentence was reasonable.

We have examined the entire record in accordance with the requirements of Anders and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. This court requires that counsel inform Delgado, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Delgado 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 Delgado. 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