

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-11873

Non-Argument Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

CARLTON RAMON ALEXANDER,
a.k.a. Duke,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 3:23-cr-00297-LSC-HNJ-1

Before JILL PRYOR, BRANCH, and BRASHER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Perry Steen, appointed counsel for Carlton Alexander 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 record reveals that counsel's assessment of the relative merit of the appeal is correct. Because independent examination of the record reveals no arguable issues of merit, counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**, and Alexander's conviction and sentence are **AFFIRMED**.

However, because the final judgment contains a clerical error, we **REMAND** for the limited purpose of correcting this clerical error. The judgment erroneously states that Alexander was convicted under 1 U.S.C. §§ 846, 841(a)(1), and (b)(1)(C). The district court is instructed to correct the judgment to reflect that Alexander's conviction was under 21 U.S.C. §§ 846, 841(a)(1), and (b)(1)(C), which is the statute listed in the indictment, the plea agreement, and Alexander's presentence investigation report. See *United States v. James*, 642 F.3d 1333, 1343 (11th Cir. 2011) (remanding for correction of clerical error in the statute of conviction listed in the judgment).