

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 94-60593
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,
Cross-Appellant,

versus

JACOBO ESPINOZA, a/k/a "Jake,"

Defendant-Appellant
Cross-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Southern District of Texas
(CR-L-94-66-1)

(April 27, 1995)

Before KING, JOLLY, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

The defendant-appellant, Jacobo Espinoza, was convicted for corruptly endeavoring to influence or impede a juror by offering or promising a thing of value to violate her sworn duty and for offering a thing of value with the intent to influence the verdict,

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

in violation of, respectively, 18 U.S.C. §§ 201(b)(1)(a) and 1503(a). We affirm.

The evidence was sufficient to convict Espinoza for obstruction of justice. See United States v. Moree, 897 F.2d 1329, 1333 (5th Cir. 1990). We are bound to accept the credibility choices that support this verdict. The testimony of Reynaldo, Jerry, and Leticia Rodriguez clearly establish that Espinoza offered money in order to influence the verdict of his father-in-law's trial.

With respect to the second count of conviction, i.e., bribery, Espinoza only argues that a petit juror is not a "public official." This contention is clearly mistaken. See 18 U.S.C. § 201(a)(1).

Espinoza attempts to raise other meritless arguments, but his attempt is so feeble that they amount to failure to address an issue, and, consequently, as unaddressed issues, they are not properly before us to consider. See Yohey v. Collins, 985 F.2d 222, 225 (5th Cir. 1993). He does argue briefly that he was denied a fair trial because of an improper question asked by the prosecutor on a cross-examination of a character witness. The district court, however, instructed the jury to disregard the question, and it was certainly not prejudicial in view of the strong evidence indicating Espinoza's guilt.

In sum, there is no reversible error to be found in this trial, and the judgment of the district court is

A F F I R M E D.