United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

## FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

May 17, 2007

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 06-30093 Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

TYRONE D. GOODIN,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana USDC No. 3:04-CR-30040-1

\_\_\_\_\_

Before REAVLEY, GARZA and BENAVIDES, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:\*

Tyrone D. Goodin appeals his guilty-plea conviction and 18-month sentence for possession of an unregistered firearm. Goodin contends that the district court erred in denying his motions to suppress. Goodin has waived this issue by entering an unconditional guilty plea. <u>See United States v. Wise</u>, 179 F.3d 184, 186 (5th Cir. 1999); <u>United States v. Bell</u>, 966 F.2d 914, 916-17 (5th Cir. 1992).

Goodin avers that his sentence was unreasonable and that the district court erred in declining to depart downward. This court

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

does not have jurisdiction to review the district court's denial of Goodin's motion for a downward departure. <u>See United States</u> <u>v. Hernandez</u>, 457 F.3d 416, 424 (5th Cir. 2006).

However, we do have jurisdiction to review "whether the district court's imposition of a guideline sentence instead of a non-guideline sentence was reasonable." <u>See United States v.</u> <u>Nikonova</u>, 480 F.3d 371, 375 (5th Cir. 2007). The district court properly calculated the applicable guideline sentencing range and considered the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). <u>See United States v. Mares</u>, 402 F.3d 511, 518-20 (5th Cir. 2005). Therefore, Goodin has not shown that the sentence imposed by the district court was unreasonable. <u>See id.</u> <u>AFFIRMED</u>.