

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 22-10541

Non-Argument Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

*versus*

JOSE RICARDO VALDEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

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

D.C. Docket No. 8:21-cr-00031-SCB-CPT-1

---

Before ROSENBAUM, LUCK, and LAGOA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Victor Martinez, appointed counsel for Jose Valdez in this direct criminal appeal, has moved to withdraw from further representation of the appellant and filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Our independent review of the entire record reveals that counsel's assessment of the relative merit of the appeal is correct. Because independent examination of the entire record reveals no arguable issues of merit, counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**, and Valdez's conviction and sentence are **AFFIRMED**. Valdez's request for new counsel is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

We note that Valdez's response to counsel's motion to withdraw contains allegations that counsel provided ineffective assistance. Because claims of ineffective assistance of counsel are best presented in a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion rather than on direct appeal, we decline to consider these claims at this time, *see Massaro v. United States*, 538 U.S. 500, 504–05, 508 (2003), though Valdez may raise these allegations on collateral review in a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.