

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-40681
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

RODNEY ERROLL COLEMAN,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 1:01-CR-175-ALL

January 30, 2003

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, SMITH, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Rodney Erroll Coleman appeals his conviction and sentence following a conditional guilty plea to one count of possessing a firearm while unlawfully using a controlled substance. 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(3). Coleman first argues that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress evidence because his consent to search his vehicle was not given voluntarily. We assess the voluntariness of consent under the test set forth in United

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

States v. Jones, 234 F.3d 234, 242 (5th Cir. 2000). Coleman has failed to show that the district court's finding of voluntary consent "was clearly erroneous or influenced by an incorrect view of law." United States v. Shabazz, 993 F.2d 431, 439 (5th Cir. 1993); see United States v. Watson, 273 F.3d 599, 604 (5th Cir. 2001).

Coleman also argues that the district court clearly erred by adding two offense levels for obstruction of justice pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1. Coleman has failed to show that the district court's determination that he attempted to influence the testimony of a witness to his offense was clearly erroneous. See U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1, comment. (n.4(a)); United States v. Bethley, 973 F.2d 396, 402 (5th Cir. 1992).

AFFIRMED.