UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

| | No. 00-20452 Summary Calendar | |
|---------------|---|----------------------|
| UNITED STATES | OF AMERICA, | Plaintiff-Appellee, |
| | versus | |
| JOSE A. DIAZ, | | Defendant-Appellant. |
| | Appeal from the United States District Coufor the Southern District of Texas USDC No. H-99-CR-738-1 | ırt |
| | March 15, 2001 | |

Before POLITZ, DAVIS, and BENAVIDES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Jose A. Diaz appeals his conviction and sentence for conspiracy to possess cocaine and for the possession of cocaine with intent to distribute.¹ He contends

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 R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

¹21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) & (b)(1), 846.

that: (1) there was insufficient evidence to support his conviction; (2) the district court erred in calculating the drug quantity for sentencing purposes; and (3) in light of <u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u>, 120 S.Ct. 2348 (2000), and <u>Jones v. United</u> <u>States</u>, 526 U.S. 227 (1999), the district court erred in not presenting the drug-quantity issue to the jury.

Our review of the record and briefs of the parties persuades that the evidence was sufficient for a reasonable jury to find Diaz guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.² Further, the district court did not err when it estimated the drug quantity for sentencing based on the facts contained in the presentence investigation report which it adopted.³ Finally, Diaz's contention with respect to the teachings of <u>Apprendi</u> and <u>Jones</u> lacks merit because he obviously was sentenced below the statutory maximum.⁴ Accordingly, Diaz's conviction and sentence are AFFIRMED.

²<u>United States v. Meshack</u>, 225 F.3d 556 (5th Cir. 2000), *cert. denied sub nom*. <u>Parker v. United States</u>, 121 S. Ct. 834 (2001); <u>United States v. Westbrook</u>, 119 F.3d 1176 (5th Cir. 1997).

³United States v. Franklin, 148 F.3d 451 (5th Cir. 1998).

⁴<u>United States v. Doggett</u>, 230 F.3d 160 (5th Cir. 2000), *petition for cert. filed* (Jan. 4, 2001) (No. 00-7819); <u>United States v. Keith</u>, 230 F.3d 784 (5th Cir. 2000), *petition for cert. filed* (Jan. 16, 2001) (No. 00-8077).