

**FILED**  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
**Tenth Circuit**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

**November 12, 2021**

**Christopher M. Wolpert**  
**Clerk of Court**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

IBANGA ETUK, a/k/a Mark,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 21-5062  
(D.C. No. 4:20-CR-00100-CVE-1)  
(N.D. Okla.)

---

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\***

---

Before **McHUGH, MORITZ, and CARSON**, Circuit Judges.

---

Ibanga Etuk pled guilty to bank fraud and aggravated identity theft, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1344(2) and 1028A. The district court sentenced him to 48 months’ imprisonment. Although his plea agreement contained a broad waiver of his appellate rights, he filed a notice of appeal. The government has moved to enforce the appeal waiver under *United States v. Hahn*, 359 F.3d 1315 (10th Cir. 2004) (en banc) (per curiam).

Under *Hahn*, we consider “(1) whether the disputed appeal falls within the scope of the waiver of appellate rights; (2) whether the defendant knowingly and

---

\* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

voluntarily waived his appellate rights; and (3) whether enforcing the waiver would result in a miscarriage of justice.” *Id.* at 1325. The government asserts that all of the *Hahn* conditions have been satisfied: (1) Etuk’s appeal is within the scope of the appeal waiver because his sentence was within the range contemplated by the plea agreement; (2) he knowingly and voluntarily waived his appellate rights; and (3) enforcing the waiver would not result in a miscarriage of justice. In response, Etuk, through counsel, states he “do[es] not contest the government’s motion.” Resp. at 2.

Based on this concession and our independent review of the record, we grant the government’s motion and dismiss the appeal. We do so, however, without prejudice to Etuk’s right to pursue post-conviction relief on the grounds permitted in his plea agreement.

Entered for the Court  
Per Curiam