

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-3478

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Troy Wayne Fletcher,

Appellant.

*
*
*
* Appeal from the United States
* District Court for the
* Western District of Arkansas.
*
* [UNPUBLISHED]
*

Submitted: October 14, 2011

Filed: October 18, 2011

Before WOLLMAN, SMITH, and GRUENDER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Troy Wayne Fletcher pleaded guilty to receiving child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(2) and (b)(1), and failing to appear, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 3146(a)(1). The district court¹ sentenced him to 288 months in prison, consisting of a 240-month term on the child-pornography offense and a consecutive 48-month term on the failure-to-appear offense. The court imposed a life term of supervised release, with several special conditions.

¹The Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas.

Fletcher's counsel moved to withdraw and filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). After we reviewed the record independently pursuant to Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we denied counsel's motion to withdraw and directed the parties to brief whether the district court erred in imposing a special condition of supervised release prohibiting Fletcher from having internet access at his residence, and from having--without prior approval by the probation office and a justified reason--access to an internet-connected computer or other device with internet capabilities or access to the internet from any location. After careful review of the record and the arguments advanced by both parties, we conclude that, given the particular facts of this case, the district court did not plainly err in imposing the special condition regarding internet access. See United States v. Koch, 625 F.3d 470, 481-82 (8th Cir. 2010); United States v. Durham, 618 F.3d 921, 943-45 (8th Cir. 2010); see also United States v. Smith, No. 10-3579, 2011 WL 4104915, at *3 (8th Cir. Sept. 16, 2011).

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court.
