United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

June 18, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 02-50412 Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JOSE ALFREDO BONILLA-MORALES,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas USDC No. P-01-CR-411-1

Before JOLLY, DAVIS and EMILIO M. GARZA, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:*

Jose Alfredo Bonilla-Morales appeals from his jury-verdict conviction for importation of cocaine and possession with intent to distribute cocaine. Bonilla was arrested after the vehicle he drove from Mexico into the United States was found to contain a large amount of cocaine in a hidden compartment. His sole argument on appeal is that the evidence was insufficient to prove the knowledge element for each count of conviction.

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

Looking at the evidence in the light most favorable to the verdict, we discern many factors indicating that Bonilla was aware that the vehicle he was driving contained illegal drugs, including the fact that he displayed signs of extreme nervousness before and after his arrest, he provided conflicting statements to the authorities regarding the details of his trip, he was paid an extremely generous amount for the time involved in making this trip, the alterations made to the vehicle to create the hidden compartment were noticeable to the naked eye, and the vehicle contained 343 pounds of cocaine. See United States v. Ortega Reyna, 148 F.3d 540, 544 (5th Cir. 1998). Regardless of the standard of review that we apply, Bonilla's challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the knowledge element of both counts of conviction fails because the evidence produced at trial was sufficient to support the jury's verdict on that basis.

Accordingly, the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.