

April 17, 2007

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-51451  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JACQUE DESHAWN KING, SR., also known as Jacque Deshawn King,

Defendant-Appellant.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 6:05-CR-74-ALL  
-----

Before DeMOSS, STEWART, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Jacque Deshawn King, Sr. appeals the sentence imposed following his guilty-plea conviction for possession of a firearm by a convicted felon in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1) and 924(a)(2). He argues that the district court erred in imposing a federal sentence to run consecutively to a not-yet-imposed state sentence. We have held that such a sentence is proper under 18 U.S.C. § 3584(a) and U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3, (p.s.). United States v. Brown, 920 F.2d 1212, 1217 (5th Cir. 1991). Therefore, King's argument is foreclosed by Brown.

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

King argues that the sentence imposed by the district court was unreasonable. The sentence imposed by the district court is accorded "great deference" because it was the Guidelines sentence imposed pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 5G1.1(a). See United States v. Mares, 402 F.3d 511, 519 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 43 (2005). King does not argue that the district court misapplied the Guidelines or miscalculated the applicable Guideline range. King's argument that the consecutive sentence could result in a sentencing disparity is based on speculation as King has not shown that his sentence was more severe than similarly-situated defendants nationwide. See United States v. Duhon, 440 F.3d 711, 721 (5th Cir. 2006), petition for cert. filed, (U.S. May 18, 2006) (No. 05-11144). King has not shown that the sentence imposed by the district court was unreasonable. See Mares, 402 F.3d at 519.

AFFIRMED.