

File Name: 09a0351n.06

Nos. 07-2556, 07-2557, and 08-1513

FILED
May 20, 2009
LEONARD GREEN, Clerk

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Dockets.Justia.com

07-2556, 07-2557, and 08-1513
United States v. Anderson et al.

for Kama. The district court thereafter sentenced Anderson to 57 months' imprisonment, and Kama to 48 months' imprisonment.

Shaba pled guilty to involvement in a separate conspiracy, which arose from his sale of 3,100 MDMA pills. The total weight of the pills was unknown, so the district court calculated Shaba's base-offense level based on the "typical weight" for each pill under § 2D1.1, Note 11. The district court then sentenced him to 51 months' imprisonment, which was within his Guidelines range of 51-63 months.

These consolidated appeals followed.

II.

We review a district court's factual findings in sentencing a defendant for clear error, *United States v. Hazelwood*, 398 F.3d 792, 795 (6th Cir. 2005), and its application and interpretation of the Guidelines *de novo*. *United States v. Cousins*, 469 F.3d 572, 575 (6th Cir. 2006).

Defendants contend that, in calculating their base-offense level, the district court should have considered only the weight of the "pure" MDMA itself, rather than the weight of the entire pill. This argument is plainly foreclosed by precedent. "This court has repeatedly rejected the argument that only the 'pure' weight of a controlled substance should be used as the basis for calculating a defendant's base offense level instead of the weight of the entire pill." *United States v. Jeross*, 521 F.3d 562, 577 (6th Cir. 2008). To the contrary, "a defendant's base-offense level is to be determined by the *entire* weight of the pill containing the controlled substance, and not by the weight of the actual controlled substance alone (i.e., the weight of the pure MDA, MDMA, or meth contained in the pill)." *Id.* (emphasis in original).

07-2556, 07-2557, and 08-1513
United States v. Anderson et al.

The district court's judgment is affirmed.