

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

February 11, 2009

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

---

No. 08-10259  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

CARRIE RENE CRAFT

Defendant-Appellant

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:07-CR-144-1

---

Before DAVIS, GARZA, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Carrie Rene Craft appeals from the sentence imposed following her guilty-plea conviction for possession of counterfeit obligations of the United States. She argues that her sentence was unreasonable because, in light of the mitigating factors at issue in her case, the imposed term of imprisonment was greater than necessary to achieve the objectives set forth at 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). As she argued in the district court prior to sentencing, Craft asserts on appeal that she merits leniency because she provided assistance to the authorities immediately

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

upon her arrest and because her assistance led to the arrest of her codefendant/husband. The district court explicitly noted before imposing Craft's sentence that it had considered Craft's arguments as to mitigating factors, as well as the § 3553(a) factors.

We consider Craft's argument as to the substantive reasonableness of her sentence under an abuse-of-discretion standard, taking into account the totality of the circumstances. See *Gall v. United States*, 128 S. Ct. 586, 597 (2007). Also, because Craft's sentence was imposed within a properly calculated Guidelines range, it is entitled to a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness. *United States v. Alonzo*, 435 F.3d 551, 554 (5th Cir. 2006); *Rita v. United States*, 127 S. Ct. 2456, 2462 (2007). After reviewing the substantive reasonableness of the sentence imposed, we hold that Craft's appellate arguments fail to establish that her sentence was unreasonable. Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is **AFFIRMED**