

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 25 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 21-10234

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. No.

1:18-cr-00044-DAD-BAM-1

v.

LINDA ROSE EXPOSE,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Dale A. Drozd, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 17, 2022**

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Linda Rose Expose appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges her guilty-plea conviction and 24-month sentence for aggravated identity theft, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1). Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Expose'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. We have provided Expose the opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief. No pro se supplemental brief or answering brief has been filed.

Expose waived her right to appeal her conviction and sentence. Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), discloses no arguable issue as to the validity of the waiver. *See United States v. Watson*, 582 F.3d 974, 986-88 (9th Cir. 2009). We accordingly dismiss the appeal. *See id.* at 988.

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

DISMISSED.