

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 17 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

CHARLES JAMES WILLIAMS,

Defendant-Appellant.

Nos. 21-30068
21-30069

D.C. Nos. 2:07-cr-00380-RSM-1
2:07-cr-00426-RSM-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Ricardo S. Martinez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 15, 2022**

Before: FERNANDEZ, TASHIMA, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated appeals, Charles James Williams appeals from the district court's judgments revoking supervised release and challenges the 24-month concurrent sentences imposed. Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Williams's counsel has filed a brief stating that there are no grounds for

* 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).

relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. Williams has filed a pro se supplemental opening brief, and the government has filed an answering brief.

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. Williams's pro se arguments are not supported by the record or the law. His arguments concerning his state court proceedings may not be raised in this appeal from the revocation of his federal supervised release term. To the extent Williams seeks to raise a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, we do not reach that claim on direct appeal. *See United States v. Rahman*, 642 F.3d 1257, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 2011).

The government's motion to take judicial notice, and counsel's motion to withdraw, are **GRANTED**. All other pending motions are denied.

AFFIRMED.