

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 24-3535

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

James Wedlow

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Western District of Missouri - Kansas City

Submitted: March 27, 2025

Filed: April 23, 2025

[Unpublished]

Before BENTON, GRASZ, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

James Wedlow appeals the below-Guidelines sentence the district court¹ imposed after he pled guilty to being a prohibited person in possession of a firearm. Having jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, this court affirms.

¹The Honorable Beth Phillips, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri.

Counsel moved for leave to withdraw and filed a brief under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the sentence as substantively unreasonable. Upon careful review, this court concludes that the district court did not impose a substantively unreasonable sentence, as it properly considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors; there is no indication that it overlooked a relevant factor, or committed a clear error of judgment in weighing relevant factors; and the sentence was below the advisory Guidelines range. See *United States v. Feemster*, 572 F.3d 455, 461 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (abuse of discretion review); *United States v. Anderson*, 90 F.4th 1226, 1227 (8th Cir. 2024) (district court has wide latitude in weighing relevant factors); *United States v. McCauley*, 715 F.3d 1119, 1127 (8th Cir. 2013) (when district court varies below Guidelines range, it is “nearly inconceivable” that court abused its discretion in not varying further).

Having independently reviewed the record pursuant to *Penon v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), this court finds no non-frivolous issues for appeal.

The judgment is affirmed and counsel’s motion to withdraw is granted.
