

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 5, 2013

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 11-51070

Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

LEE EDWARD ADCOCK, also known as Lee Adcock,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 6:11-CR-52-1

Before SMITH, PRADO, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

The attorney appointed to represent Lee Edward Adcock has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed briefs in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *United States v. Flores*, 632 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2011). Adcock has filed responses. The record is insufficiently developed to allow consideration at this time of Adcock's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; such a claim generally "cannot be resolved on direct appeal when the claim has not been raised before the district court since no opportunity existed to develop

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 11-51070

the record on the merits of the allegations.” *United States v. Cantwell*, 470 F.3d 1087, 1091 (5th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). We have reviewed counsel’s briefs and the relevant portions of the record reflected therein, as well as Adcock’s responses. We concur with counsel’s assessment that the appeal presents no nonfrivolous issue for appellate review. 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. Adcock’s motions to strike the *Anders* briefs are DENIED.