

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 22-1394

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Alec Respects Nothing

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the District of South Dakota - Western

Submitted: September 6, 2022

Filed: September 12, 2022

[Unpublished]

Before SHEPHERD, MELLOY, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Alec Respects Nothing received a 144-month prison sentence after a jury found him guilty of conspiracy to distribute methamphetamine. 21 U.S.C.

§§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(A), 846. An *Anders* brief suggests that the district court¹ deprived him of a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161; *see Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). A pro se supplemental brief raises several other issues.

We conclude that there has been no violation of the Speedy Trial Act. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h); *see also United States v. Aldaco*, 477 F.3d 1008, 1017–18 (8th Cir. 2007) (holding that there was no Speedy Trial Act problem because of “excludable” days). Nor has there been a violation of his speedy-trial rights under the Sixth Amendment. *See* U.S. Const. amend. VI; *United States v. Shepard*, 462 F.3d 847, 864–65 (8th Cir. 2006).

His other arguments fare no better. The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying his motion to sever, *see United States v. Clay*, 579 F.3d 919, 927 (8th Cir. 2009), and nothing in the record shows that the government vindictively sought a higher sentence because he opted for trial, *see Corbitt v. New Jersey*, 439 U.S. 212, 223–24 (1978).

Finally, we have independently reviewed the record and conclude that no other non-frivolous issues exist. *See Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 82–83 (1988). We accordingly affirm the judgment of the district court and grant counsel permission to withdraw.

¹The Honorable Karen E. Schreier, United States District Judge for the District of South Dakota.