

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

October 20, 2009

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_

No. 09-40065  
Conference Calendar

\_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

FERNANDO ROSAS-LOPEZ,

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 7:08-CR-644-1

\_\_\_\_\_

Before WIENER, BENAVIDES, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The Federal Public Defender appointed to represent Fernando Rosas-Lopez has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Rosas-Lopez has filed a response. The record is insufficiently developed to allow consideration at this time of Rosas-Lopez's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; such a claim generally "cannot be resolved on direct appeal when [it has] not been raised before the district court since no opportunity existed to develop the record on the merits of

\_\_\_\_\_

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

the allegations.” *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 Rosas-Lopez’s response discloses no nonfrivolous issue for appeal. Accordingly, counsel’s 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.

Rosas-Lopez’s motion to proceed pro se and for the *Anders* brief to be stricken are DENIED. *See United States v. Wagner*, 158 F.3d 901, 902-03 (5th Cir. 1998).