

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals

**For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted July 14, 2026

Decided July 14, 2026

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Chief Judge*

KENNETH F. RIPPLE, *Circuit Judge*

JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-3095

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

CHARLES A. CARROLL,
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Southern District of Illinois.

No. 3:19-CR-30020-SMY-1

Staci M. Yandle,
Chief Judge.

ORDER

Charles Carroll appeals the sentence imposed upon the revocation of his supervised release, but his appointed counsel asserts that the appeal is frivolous and moves to withdraw. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). A defendant who appeals a revocation order does not have an unqualified constitutional right to counsel, *see Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778, 788–90 (1973), so the *Anders* safeguards need not govern our review. Even so, our practice is to apply them. *See United States v. Durham*, 922 F.3d 845, 847 (7th Cir. 2019). Counsel’s brief explains the nature of the case and

addresses the issues that an appeal of this kind would be expected to involve. Because counsel's analysis appears thorough, and Carroll did not respond to the motion, *see* CIR. R. 51(b), we limit our review to the subjects that counsel discusses. *See United States v. Bey*, 748 F.3d 774, 776 (7th Cir. 2014).

Carroll pleaded guilty to firearm and counterfeiting offenses in 2019, *see* 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 472, and he was sentenced to 46 months' imprisonment and 3 years' supervised release. Carroll violated the conditions of supervised release in 2023 and was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment and 24 months' supervised release.

Carroll violated the conditions of his second term of supervised release in 2025. He did not report changes in residence and employment to his probation officer, attend treatment programs, make required payments, maintain employment, or comply with home confinement. He also possessed and used drugs.

At the revocation hearing, Carroll admitted to the violations. Both the government and Carroll's attorney requested 12 months' imprisonment with no supervised release to follow. The district court revoked Carroll's supervision and sentenced him to 18 months' imprisonment with no further term of supervised release. The court reasoned that this sentence was necessary to deter Carroll and to protect the public from criminal conduct.

In her *Anders* brief, counsel tells us that Carroll wishes to challenge only the reasonableness of his sentence and not the revocation of his supervised release. Counsel therefore appropriately declines to explore any challenge to the voluntariness of his admissions or to the revocation decision. *See United States v. Wheeler*, 814 F.3d 856, 857 (7th Cir. 2016).

Counsel considers possible procedural challenges to the sentence and rightly concludes that any such challenge would be frivolous. The district court complied with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.1 by informing Carroll of his rights and allowing him to appear and make a statement. The court then correctly determined that Carroll's violations were Grade B violations under the policy statement of the Sentencing Guidelines. *See* U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a)(2). Combined with Carroll's criminal history category of III from the underlying offense, the court properly calculated a guidelines range of 8 to 14 months. *See id.* § 7B1.4(a).

Counsel next discusses a challenge to the substantive reasonableness of Carroll's prison term of 18 months and correctly concludes that any challenge would be frivolous. Carroll's sentence exceeds the guidelines range by four months, but counsel acknowledges that no argument would overcome the "highly deferential" standard under which we review a revocation sentence. *United States v. Childs*, 39 F.4th 941, 944–45 (7th Cir. 2022). Here, the district court correctly identified the relevant sentencing factors in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) and discussed Carroll's criminal history ("your criminal history, history of addiction, use of dangerous drugs [] poses a significant threat to the public of future crimes") and his need for deterrence ("I sentenced you to 12 months the first time. It didn't deter you."). And Carroll's 18-month sentence does not exceed the statutory maximum of two years for his original offense, a Class C felony. *See* 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 472, 3583(e)(3).

Therefore, we GRANT counsel's motion to withdraw and DISMISS the appeal.