

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-11656
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 8:12-cr-00479-JDW-TBM-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

DAVID DWINELL,
a.k.a. David J. Dwinell,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida

(April 18, 2014)

Before HULL, MARCUS, and MARTIN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Kenneth S. Siegel, appointed counsel for David Dwinell in this direct criminal appeal, has moved to withdraw from further representation and filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396 (1967). Our independent review of the entire record reveals that counsel's assessment of the merit of the appeal is correct. We agree with Siegel that Dwinell's guilty plea was knowing and intelligent, see United States v. Ternus, 598 F.3d 1251, 1254 (11th Cir. 2010), and find his sentence procedurally reasonable, see Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 41, 128 S. Ct. 586, 597 (2007). We also examined the issue, missing from Siegel's brief, of whether the district court plainly erred by imposing a term of supervised release, and conclude it did not. See United States v. Rodriguez, 627 F.3d 1372, 1380 (11th Cir. 2010); United States v. Lejarde-Rada, 319 F.3d 1288, 1291 (11th Cir. 2003). Because independent examination of the entire record reveals no arguable issues of merit, counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**, and Dwinell's convictions and sentences are **AFFIRMED**.