

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 92-8544  
Conference Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JUDITH ANN COPELAND JONES,

Defendant-Appellant.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 91-CR-101-9  
- - - - -

June 23, 1993

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, WIENER, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Judith Ann Copeland Jones appeals the district court's assessment of the amount of drugs attributable to calculate her base offense level. She argues that the district court should have based her sentence on the amount of drugs directly attributable to her and not on the amount of drugs attributed to her supplier, Lynn Dale Mooring.

A guidelines sentence will be upheld "so long as it results from a correct application of the guidelines to factual findings which are not clearly erroneous." United States v. Sarasti, 869

---

\* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

F.2d 805, 806 (5th Cir. 1989). The district court's findings regarding the quantity of drugs to be used in setting the base offense level are reviewed on appeal only for clear error.

United States v. Angulo, 927 F.2d 202, 205 (5th Cir. 1991). A defendant's base offense level shall be determined on the basis of "all acts and omissions committed or aided and abetted by the defendant, or for which the defendant would be otherwise accountable. . . ." U.S.S.G. § 1B1.3(a)(1).

Jones and Mooring were members of a large-scale drug conspiracy distributing methamphetamine/amphetamine in central Texas. Jones received methamphetamine from Mooring on a regular basis. She witnessed Mooring supply another individual and knew of his dealings with several other people. Jones knew most of the codefendants for years and had met and known other people in the conspiracy. When Jones was unable to receive a supply from Mooring, she would receive the methamphetamine from other suppliers in the conspiracy.

Individuals dealing in sizable amounts of controlled substances "should be presumed to know that they were participating in an organization beyond their individual involvement." United States v. Devine, 934 F.2d 1325, 1337 (5th Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 112 S.Ct. 954 (1992). The district court's calculation of the quantity of drugs attributable to Jones is not clearly erroneous. The appellant's sentence is AFFIRMED.