

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

---

No. 97-4218

---

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Louis Ray Jones,

Appellant.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

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[UNPUBLISHED]

---

Submitted: July 1, 1998

Filed: July 10, 1998

---

Before BOWMAN, Chief Judge, HEANEY, and MORRIS SHEPPARD ARNOLD,  
Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Louis Ray Jones appeals from the 41-month sentence imposed on him by the district court<sup>1</sup> after he pleaded guilty to possessing stolen property, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(j) and 2313 (1994). In a brief filed pursuant to Anders v. California,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren, United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

386 U.S. 738 (1967), counsel argues that the district court abused its discretion in imposing the sentence. We disagree and affirm.

We conclude the argument advanced by counsel is unreviewable, because the district court imposed a sentence within the applicable Guidelines imprisonment range of 33 to 41 months, and Jones does not contend, nor does it appear, that the range was improperly calculated or that the sentence was otherwise imposed in “violation of law.” See 18 U.S.C. § 3742(a) (1994) (bases for appeal of sentence by defendant); United States v. Woodrum, 959 F.2d 100, 101 (8th Cir. 1992) (per curiam) (sentence not reviewable merely because it is at top of properly calculated Guidelines range).

Pursuant to Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), we have conducted a de novo review for any non-frivolous issues, and have found none.

The judgment is affirmed.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.