

**United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

No. 10-3270

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Shannon B. Jackson,

Appellant.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Appeal from the United States
District Court for the
District of Nebraska.

[UNPUBLISHED]

Submitted: August 22, 2011

Filed: August 30, 2011

Before MURPHY, ARNOLD, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Shannon Jackson appeals following his conviction for attempted bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2113(a), (d) and 2. His counsel has moved to withdraw, and has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), arguing that the district court¹ erroneously denied Jackson's motion to dismiss the indictment for violations of his rights under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161 et seq., and his right to a speedy trial under the Sixth Amendment. In a pro se supplemental brief, Jackson also challenges the denial of his motion to dismiss the indictment.

¹The Honorable Joseph Bataillon, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Nebraska.

After carefully reviewing the district court's fact findings for clear error and its legal conclusions de novo, see United States v. Aldaco, 477 F.3d 1008, 1016 (8th Cir. 2007) (standards of review), we conclude that Jackson's speedy-trial arguments are without merit for the reasons stated in the district court's thorough and well-reasoned order.

Having also carefully reviewed the record independently under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues. Accordingly, we affirm, and we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, subject to counsel informing Jackson about the procedures for filing petitions for rehearing and for certiorari.
