

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-40457
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ROBERT ALVARES SOLIZ, also
known as Beto,

Defendant-Appellant,

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. C-94-CR-199-1
- - - - -

* * * * *

95-40459

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

DANIEL TEODORO BALBOA,

Defendant-Appellant,

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. C-94-CR-199-8

No. 95-40457
No. 95-40459
No. 95-40460
- 2 -

- - - - -

* * * * *

95-40460

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

REYNALDO CELSO SOLIZ,
also known as Mary Alton Ray,

Defendant-Appellant.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. C-94-CR-199-9
- - - - -

October 21, 1996
Before JONES, DeMOSS and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

The only issues presented for appeal are whether the district court erred by enhancing Robert Alvares Soliz's sentence for possession of a firearm and whether the district court erred by relying upon the hearsay statements of a confidential informant without allowing Soliz to call the informant for

* Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

No. 95-40457

No. 95-40459

No. 95-40460

- 3 -

examination to rebut the reliability of the statements.

The district court did not clearly err by enhancing Soliz's sentence under U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(b)(2) for firearms possession. The Government proved by a preponderance of the evidence that it was not clearly improbable that the firearms present in Soliz's residence were sufficiently connected to his drug-trafficking crimes. See United States v. Eastland, 989 F.2d 760, 770 (5th Cir. 1993); United States v. Paulk, 917 F.2d 879, 882 (5th Cir. 1990). The record does not reflect any reliance or consideration by the district court on a confidential informant's out-of-court statements in arriving at its drug quantity calculation. See United States v. Fitzgerald, 89 F.3d 218, 223 (5th Cir. 1996).

Daniel Teodoro Balboa and Reynaldo Celso Soliz adopted Soliz's appellate brief and did not raise any independent issues for appellate review.

AFFIRMED.