

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

December 16, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 19-10292  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

APRIL CASTRO,

Defendant-Appellant

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 5:18-CR-64-1

---

Before KING, GRAVES, and WILLETT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

April Castro appeals the 57-month sentence imposed following her guilty plea convictions for uttering and possessing forged and counterfeit securities of an organization and possession of stolen mail. Castro contends that the district court erred in calculating the intended loss under the advisory guidelines. In particular, she contends that the district court erred by using the average value of the forged blank checks and the pre-prepared checks in

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 19-10292

assigning a value to the 479 blank checks and money orders found in her possession at the time of her arrest. Castro contends that including the value of the pre-prepared checks inflated the intended loss estimate, thereby resulting in an unreasonable loss calculation in light of the record.

The district court's method of calculating loss under the Guidelines is a question of law that is reviewed de novo. *United States v. Lige*, 635 F.3d 668, 671 (5th Cir. 2011). "The district court receives wide latitude to determine the amount of loss and should make a reasonable estimate based on available information." *United States v. Jones*, 475 F.3d 701, 705 (5th Cir. 2007); see U.S.S.G. § 2B1.1, comment. (n.3(C)). We have previously approved the use of averages in estimating intended loss. See *United States v. Chappell*, 6 F.3d 1095, 1101 (5th Cir. 1993). Castro has not shown that the district court erred in the methodology used to calculate the intended loss. See *id.* Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.