

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 13-13728  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

D.C. Docket No. 3:10-cr-00277-TJC-TEM-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

LYDIA I. CLADEK,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

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

---

(March 31, 2014)

Before PRYOR, MARTIN, and FAY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Lydia Cladek appeals the district court's denial of her pro se Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure Rule 33 motion for a new trial. Maurice Grant, II, appointed counsel for Cladek, has moved to withdraw from further representation of the appellant in this appeal and filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396 (1967). Although Cladek argued in her Rule 33 motion and in response to Grant's Anders motion that counsel was ineffective, the record in this case is insufficient to review counsel's effectiveness. See United States v. Franklin, 694 F.3d 1, 8–9 (11th Cir. 2012). Claims of ineffective assistance of counsel should usually be raised in a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. United States v. Curbelo, 726 F.3d 1260, 1267 (11th Cir. 2013).

Because our independent examination of the record reveals no arguable issues of merit, counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**, and the denial of Cladek's Rule 33 motion for a new trial is **AFFIRMED**. In addition, Cladek's pro se request for new counsel in this appeal is **DENIED** as moot, and Cladek's various other requests in this appeal for relief, also filed pro se, are **DENIED**.