

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUN 02 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

VINCENTE ORTIZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 09-10291

D.C. No. 2:04-cr-01303-MHM

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Mary H. Murguia, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 25, 2010\*\*

Before: CANBY, THOMAS, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Vincente Ortiz appeals from the district court's judgment revoking his supervised release and imposing a 24-month sentence. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Ortiz's counsel has

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

filed a brief stating there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. We have provided the appellant with the opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief. No pro se supplemental brief or answering brief has been filed.

Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80-81 (1988), discloses no arguable grounds for relief on direct appeal.

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**, and the district court's judgment is **AFFIRMED**.