No. 98-30795

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-30795 Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

RODNEY ANTONIO LUSK,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana USDC No. 97-CR-116-ALL-C

March 5, 1999

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURTAM:*

Rodney Lusk appeals his jury conviction of possession with intent to distribute over five grams of cocaine base and possession with intent to distribute cocaine hydrochloride. Lusk contends that 1) the search warrant was invalid because it listed the wrong address for Lusk's house and that the district court erred in denying the motion to suppress the evidence obtained during the search and Lusk's subsequent confession and 2) that the district court should have excluded the Drug Enforcement Administration

 $^{^{*}}$ 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

(DEA) agent's expert testimony regarding drug trafficking because it improperly gave an opinion about whether Lusk had the intent to distribute and because the Government's evidence of such an intent was weak.

Our review of the record reveals that the search warrant's listing of the wrong address did not render it so facially deficient that the officers would have been unreasonable in presuming the warrant valid and that there was no possibility that the officers would have searched the wrong house. The officers acted in good faith when executing the warrant, and the district court's denial of the motion to suppress evidence and Lusk's confession was not error. See United States v. Gordon, 901 F.2d 48, 50 (5th Cir. 1990).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in admitting the DEA agent's expert testimony about drug trafficking. <u>United States v. Washington</u>, 44 F.3d 1271, 1283 (5th Cir. 1995); <u>United States v. Gonzales</u>, 131 F.3d 928, 936 (5th Cir. 1997), <u>cert. denied</u>, 118 S. Ct. 726 (1998).

AFFIRMED.