UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT
_____

No. 13-4023
_____

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

CONCETTA JACKSON,
                                                              Appellant
_____

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Crim. No. 2-07-cr-00040-002)
District Judge: Honorable Lawrence F. Stengel
_____

Submitted for Possible Summary Action
Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
December 19, 2013

Before: SMITH, HARDIMAN and VAN ANTWERPEN, <u>Circuit</u> <u>Judges</u>

(Filed: January 9, 2014)
_____

OPINION
_____

PER CURIAM

Concetta Jackson appeals the District Court's order denying her motions to reverse the

portion of her sentence that bars her from contacting her children. For the reasons below, we

will summarily affirm the District Court's order.

In September 2008, Concetta Jackson pleaded guilty to one count of using a minor to produce visual depictions of sexually explicit conduct. With limited exceptions not relevant here, she waived her right to appeal or challenge her conviction or sentence in her plea agreement. She was subsequently sentenced to 300 months and barred from contacting any victim named in the indictment including her four children. Despite this, she filed a direct appeal, a § 2255 motion, and an application for permission to file a second or successive § 2255 motion. All were unsuccessful. In February 2012 and August 2013, Jackson filed motions challenging the no-contact provision of her sentence. The District Court denied the motions, and Jackson filed a notice of appeal.

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. The District Court thoroughly addressed Jackson's motions in its September 6th memorandum. We agree with the District Court that Jackson waived any challenge to her sentence and that her challenge is meritless.

Summary action is appropriate if there is no substantial question presented in the appeal. See Third Circuit LAR 27.4. For the above reasons, as well as those set forth by the District Court, we will summarily affirm the District Court's order. See Third Circuit I.O.P. 10.6.