

JUL 19 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellee,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ALEXIS CHAVEZ-ARUJAS,</p> <p>Defendant - Appellant.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

No. 11-10153

D.C. No. 4:10-cr-01296-CKJ-BPV-1

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Cindy K. Jorgenson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 17, 2012\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, THOMAS and SILVERMAN, Circuit Judges.

Alexis Chavez-Arujas appeals from his guilty-plea conviction and 33-month sentence for being an illegal alien found in the United States after having been previously removed, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a). Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Chavez-Arujas’s counsel has filed a brief stating

---

\* 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).

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.<sup>1</sup> We dismiss in light of the valid appeal waiver. *See United States v. Nguyen*, 235 F.3d 1179, 1182 (9th Cir. 2000).

Counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**.

**DISMISSED.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decline to review Chavez-Arujas's ineffective assistance of counsel claim because the record is not sufficiently developed to permit review on direct appeal. *See United States v. Leasure*, 319 F.3d 1092, 1099 (9th Cir. 2003).