# (fnited $\mathcal{B r a t e s} \mathbb{C}$ ourt of $\mathfrak{A p p e a l s}$ yfor the $\mathbb{E}$ ighty $\mathbb{C}$ ircuit 

No. 16-3303

United States of America
Plaintiff-Appellee
v.

Anthony Lovon Dixon

> Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri - Springfield

Submitted: February 21, 2017
Filed: February 27, 2017
[Unpublished]

Before COLLOTON, ARNOLD, and KELLY, Circuit Judges.

## PER CURIAM.

Anthony Dixon appeals after he pleaded guilty to failing to register as a sex offender and the district court ${ }^{1}$ sentenced him to 30 months in prison, a term within

[^0]the calculated Guidelines range. His counsel has moved for leave to withdraw, and has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). We remind counsel of their obligation in filing an Anders brief. Such a brief must be done as an advocate for the appellant, not the government, and should refer to anything in the record that might arguably support the appeal. See Evans v. Clarke, 868 F.2d 267, 268 (8th Cir. 1989). Nonetheless, we read counsel's brief as questioning the reasonableness of Dixon's prison term. Dixon has not filed a supplemental brief.

Upon careful review, we conclude that the district court did not commit any significant procedural errors or impose a substantively unreasonable sentence. See United States v. David, 682 F.3d 1074, 1076-77 (8th Cir. 2012) (discussing appellate review of sentencing decisions); see also United States v. Callaway, 762 F.3d 754, 760 (8th Cir. 2014) (on appeal, within-Guidelines-range sentence may be presumed reasonable). In addition, we have independently reviewed the record under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), and have found no nonfrivolous issues for appeal.

Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we affirm.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Honorable Roseann A. Ketchmark, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

