



---

2002 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

11-6-2002

## USA v. Williams

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2002](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002)

---

### Recommended Citation

"USA v. Williams" (2002). *2002 Decisions*. 705.

[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2002/705](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002/705)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2002 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 01-2308

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

CHARLES WILLIAMS,  
Appellant

---

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

(D.C. Crim No. 00-cr-00366-1 )

District Judge: Honorable Petrese B. Tucker

---

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)  
November 1, 2002

Before: NYGAARD and WEIS, Circuit Judges, and IRENAS,\* District Judge.

Filed: November 6, 2002

---

OPINION

---

---

\* The Honorable Joseph E. Irenas, United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, sitting by designation.

WEIS, Circuit Judge.

Defendant pleaded guilty to a one count indictment charging him with selling counterfeit United States currency in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 472. During an interview with a probation officer following the plea, defendant gave an incorrect name, social security number, and birthdate. In addition, defendant falsely denied having a prior criminal record.

At sentencing, the district judge applied an obstruction of justice enhancement, denied a reduction because of acceptance of responsibility, and imposed a period of twelve months incarceration.

On appeal, defense counsel filed an Anders brief, which we have carefully reviewed along with the other matters of record. Defendant did not file a pro se brief.

We conclude that the District Court did not err. Accordingly, the judgment of the District Court will be affirmed.

The motion of defense counsel to withdraw will be granted.

---

TO THE CLERK:

Please file the foregoing Opinion.

/s/ Joseph F. Weis, Jr.  
United States Circuit Judge