

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

April 24, 2013

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 11-50816

Summary Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

ANGELA MARIE CUELLAR, also known as Angela Cuellar,

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 6:10-CR-288-1  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before BENAVIDES, HAYNES, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Angela Marie Cuellar was convicted of one count of conspiracy to commit identity theft, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1028(f), and four counts of aggravated identity theft, violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1). The district court imposed a 24-month imprisonment term for her conspiracy conviction and consecutive 24-month imprisonment terms for each of her convictions for aggravated identity theft, resulting in a total of 10 years of imprisonment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 11-50816

Cuellar argues that the district court abused its discretion in ordering the imprisonment terms for her aggravated identity theft convictions to run consecutively to each other. The district court had the discretion to determine whether those imprisonment terms would be served concurrently or consecutively. *See* § 1028A(b)(4). In light of the evidence regarding the extensiveness of Cuellar's criminal conduct, the district court did not abuse its discretion. *See* § 1028A(b)(4); U.S.S.G. § 5G1.2, comment. (n.2(B)).

According to Cuellar, the district court also failed to adequately provide reasons for its decision to impose the consecutive sentences. Because she did not object on this ground in the district court, plain error review applies. *See United States v. Mondragon-Santiago*, 564 F.3d 357, 361 (5th Cir. 2009). Cuellar has not shown any clear or obvious error regarding the adequacy of the district court's reasons.

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.