IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-10990 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

FRED ZAPATA GUERRERO,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 6:98-CR-80-2

June 13, 2000

Before JOLLY, DAVIS, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Fred Zapata Guerrero appeals his sentence following a guilty-plea conviction for possession of stolen firearms in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(j) and 924(a)(2).

This court reviews the sentencing judge's application of the sentencing guidelines <u>de novo</u> and accepts the sentencing judge's findings of fact unless they are clearly erroneous. <u>United</u>

<u>States v. Rodriguez-Guzman</u>, 56 F.3d 18, 20 (5th Cir. 1995).

Guerrero argues that a 1988 aggravated-assault offense should not be used to calculate his base offense level under

^{*} Pursuant to 5^{TH} 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5^{TH} CIR. R. 47.5.4.

U.S.S.G. § 2K2.1 because he was given deferred adjudication for the offense. He argues that, because the deferred adjudication has not been finally adjudicated, it should not be counted as a conviction under § 2K2.1. We have previously determined that a deferred adjudication can be used when calculating a defendant's base offense level under § 2K2.1. <u>United States v. Stauder</u>, 73 F.3d 56, 57 (5th Cir. 1996).

Guerrero admits that he is aware of <u>Stauder</u>, but he urges this court to overrule its opinion in that case. One panel of this court may not overrule the decision of a prior panel in the absence of an intervening contrary or superseding decision by this court sitting en banc or by the United States Supreme Court. <u>Burge v. Parish of St. Tammany</u>, 187 F.3d 452, 466 (5th Cir. 1999). Therefore, Guerrero's request that this court revisit the decision in <u>Stauder</u> is without merit, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.