

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

April 16, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 07-51111  
Conference Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

JACK WILLIAM STANFORD

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 7:07-CR-44-ALL  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before PRADO, OWEN, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The attorney appointed to represent Jack William Stanford has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Stanford has filed a response. The record is insufficiently developed to allow consideration at this time of Stanford's claims of ineffective assistance of counsel; such claims generally "cannot be resolved on direct appeal when [they have] not been raised before the district court since no opportunity

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

existed to develop the record on the merits of the allegations.” See *United States v. Cantwell*, 470 F.3d 1087, 1091 (5th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Our independent review of the record, counsel’s brief, and Stanford’s response discloses no nonfrivolous issue for appeal. Accordingly, the motion for leave to withdraw is GRANTED, counsel is excused from further responsibilities herein, and the APPEAL IS DISMISSED. See 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.