

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 21 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CANDICE LEWIS,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

WALTER MILLER,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 13-16078

D.C. No. 2:11-cv-00423-TLN

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Troy L. Nunley, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 16, 2016**

Before: LEAVY, BERZON, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Candice Lewis appeals from the district court's order denying her 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Lewis's counsel has filed a brief stating that there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. We have provided Lewis the

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief. No pro se supplemental brief or answering brief has been filed.

Our independent review of the briefing and record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), discloses that the certified issue provides no basis for appellate relief. *See Graves v. McEwen*, 731 F.3d 876, 880-81 (9th Cir. 2013).

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

AFFIRMED.