

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 94-50717  
Conference Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

LIGIA BALU, a/k/a Lidia Balu,  
a/k/a Sanel Solzenberg,  
a/k/a Chanel Solzenberg,  
a/k/a Chanel Stolzenberg,  
a/k/a Sanel Stolzenberg,  
a/k/a Rita Dimuci,  
a/k/a Rita Dimici,

Defendant-Appellant.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. SA-90-CR-43(1)

- - - - -  
(January 24, 1995)

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

PER CURIAM:\*

Ligia Balu filed her notice of appeal from the district court's denial of her motions to reconsideration of her motions for early probation termination, not from her original motions requesting early termination of her probation. Yet, on appeal, Balu does not argue that the district court erred in denying her

---

\* 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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

motions for reconsideration, but instead, argues that the district court erred in its original denial of her motions for early termination of probation and requests that she be discharged from probation. Because Balu does not address on appeal the district court's actions in dismissing her motions for reconsideration, she has abandoned it. Brinkmann v. Abner, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Additionally, there is no basis to challenge the district court's denial of the reconsideration motions as the motions were not timely filed. See United States v. Cook, 670 F.2d 46, 48 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 456 U.S. 382 (1982); Fed. R. App. P. 4(b).

AFFIRMED.