United States Court of Appeals

For the Eighth Circuit

No. 18-3400
United States of America
Plaintiff - Appellee
v.
Jeffery Stanbrough, also known as Jeffrey Allen Stanbrough
Defendant - Appellant
No. 18-3401
United States of America
Plaintiff - Appellee
v.
Jeffery Stanbrough, also known as Jeffrey Allen Stanbrough
Defendant - Appellant
Appeals from United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas - Harrison
Submitted: May 31, 2019 Filed: June 5, 2019 [Unpublished]

Before ERICKSON, WOLLMAN, and GRASZ, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated cases, Jeffery Stanbrough appeals the revocation sentence the district court¹ imposed after he was found to have violated the terms of his supervised release, and the sentence imposed after he pleaded guilty to a new drug offense. His counsel has filed a brief that cites <u>Anders v. California</u>, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and challenges the reasonableness of each sentence. Counsel has also moved for leave to withdraw.

We conclude that the district court imposed a substantively reasonable sentence in each case. See United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (discussing substantive reasonableness); see also United States v. McGhee, 869 F.3d 703, 705 (8th Cir. 2017) (per curiam) (substantive reasonableness of revocation sentence is reviewed under same abuse-of-discretion standard that is applied to initial sentencing decisions); United States v. Wohlman, 651 F.3d 878, 887 (8th Cir. 2011) (district court need not mechanically recite 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, so long as it is clear from the record that court considered them in determining sentence).

We have independently reviewed the record under <u>Penson v. Ohio</u>, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), and there are no non-frivolous issues for appeal. The judgments are affirmed, and counsel is granted leave to withdraw.

¹The Honorable P.K. Holmes, III, United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.