

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-10231
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

HUBERT EARL LAWSON

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:99-CR-295-1-G

February 8, 2001

Before KING, Chief Judge, and SMITH and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Hubert Earl Lawson appeals his convictions under 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). He contends that the Government did not demonstrate that the firearms had the requisite effect on interstate commerce. Lawson also contends that 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) is unconstitutional. Lawson concedes that his arguments are foreclosed by circuit precedent, and he raises the arguments to preserve them for Supreme Court review. These issues are foreclosed. See *United States v. Rawls*, 85 F.3d 240, 242-43 (5th Cir. 1996).

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

Lawson next challenges the district court's order that his sentences run consecutively. He asserts that the district court did not comply with 28 U.S.C. § 3584(b), did not consider the factors listed in 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553(a), and did not provide reasons for imposing consecutive sentences. We rejected similar arguments in *United States v. Izaguirre-Losoya*, 219 F.3d 437, 439-40 (5th Cir. 2000), *cert. denied*, 2001 WL 13127 (2001). The record supports the inference that the district court considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, and Lawson has not shown plain error. *See id.*

Finally, Lawson contends that his 1984 state convictions were related or consolidated cases. Lawson's 1984 Texas convictions are not factually similar, and each conviction had a separate docket number. The convictions were not for related offenses, and the cases were not consolidated. *See United States v. Garcia*, 962 F.2d 479, 482 (5th Cir. 1992); *United States v. Metcalf*, 898 F.2d 43, 46 (5th Cir. 1990). Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.