

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

January 14, 2026

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

HORACE R. WRIGHT,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-3135
(D.C. No. 6:24-CR-10017-JWB-1)
(D. Kan.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before PHILLIPS, McHUGH, and ROSSMAN, Circuit Judges.

Horace R. Wright pleaded guilty to one count of interstate travel in aid of racketeering. The district court sentenced him to 60 months in prison, which was the statutory maximum for that offense. Due to the statutory sentencing cap, the sentence fell below the advisory Sentencing Guidelines range of 97 to 121 months.

Wright seeks to appeal his conviction and sentence. The government filed a motion to enforce the appeal waiver contained in his plea agreement. *See United States v. Hahn*, 359 F.3d 1315, 1328 (10th Cir. 2004) (en banc) (per curiam). Wright's counsel responded, saying there is no non-frivolous basis to oppose the

* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

government's motion. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

Consistent with the procedure outlined in *Anders*, we invited Wright to file his own response to show why we should not enforce the appeal waiver, but he has not done so.

Under these circumstances, our duty is to examine the record and decide whether opposing the government's motion would indeed be frivolous. *See id.* We will enforce an appeal waiver if (1) the appeal falls within the waiver's scope, (2) the defendant knowingly and voluntarily waived the right to appeal, and (3) enforcing the waiver will not result in a miscarriage of justice. *See Hahn*, 359 F.3d at 1325.

Scope of the waiver. Wright seeks to appeal his conviction and sentence, but he waived the right to appeal unless his sentence exceeded the statutory maximum, his sentence exceeded the Sentencing Guidelines range, or the government appealed the sentence imposed. Because his sentence did not exceed the statutory maximum or the Sentencing Guidelines range, and the government did not appeal the sentence, Wright's waiver covers this appeal.¹

Knowing and voluntary waiver. The plea agreement and the plea colloquy show that Wright knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to appeal.

Miscarriage of justice. Enforcing an appeal waiver will result in a miscarriage of justice only if: (1) the district court relied on an impermissible factor, such as

¹ The waiver also carved out an exception for "any subsequent claims with regards to ineffective assistance of counsel or prosecutorial misconduct." Mot. to Enforce, Attach. A at 5. We take no position on claims other than the one Wright presents on appeal, which plainly falls within the waiver's scope.

race; (2) ineffective assistance of counsel in negotiating the waiver makes it invalid; (3) the sentence exceeds the statutory maximum; or (4) the waiver is otherwise unlawful in a way that seriously affects the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of the proceedings. *See id.* at 1327. Nothing in the record suggests that enforcing the appeal waiver will cause a miscarriage of justice.

We grant the government's motion to enforce the appeal waiver and dismiss this appeal.

Entered for the Court

Per Curiam