

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 21 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 20-10257

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. No. 2:14-cr-00288-ROS-1

v.

MEMORANDUM*

ALEJANDRO CASTILLO PADILLA,
AKA Alejandro Castillo-Padilla, AKA
Alejandro Castro Padilla,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Roslyn O. Silver, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 18, 2021**

Before: CANBY, FRIEDLAND, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Alejandro Castillo Padilla appeals from the revocation of supervised release and the 24-month sentence imposed upon revocation. Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Padilla's counsel has filed a brief stating that

* 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).

there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. Padilla has filed a letter, which we treat as a pro se supplemental brief. No answering brief has been filed.

Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), discloses no arguable grounds for relief on direct appeal. Padilla's pro se argument that he believed he "had a plea for 13 months," and was unaware that he could be sentenced to 24 months, is belied by the record.

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

AFFIRMED.