

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**

To be cited only in accordance with  
Fed. R. App. P. 32.1

**United States Court of Appeals**

**For the Seventh Circuit  
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

July 13, 2011

**Before**

RICHARD D. CUDAHY, *Circuit Judge*

JOEL M. FLAUM, *Circuit Judge*

DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

No. 10-1304

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

*v.*

LAWRENCE TAYLOR,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

Appeal from the United States District  
Court for the Northern District of Indiana,  
South Bend Division

No. 10-1304

Hon. Robert L. Miller, Jr.,  
*Judge.*

**ORDER**

Lawrence Taylor pleaded guilty to bank robbery in 2009, which subjected him to sentences both for the instant robbery, and for violating his supervised release in connection with a prior bank robbery. We ordered a limited remand because the district court did not clearly appreciate or exercise its discretion in making Taylor's two sentences consecutive instead of concurrent. The district court has responded, clarifying that it did understand at the time of sentencing that it could make the sentences concurrent or consecutive, and enumerating several convincing reasons for imposing the sentences consecutively. We invited the parties to respond, and Taylor's counsel supplied a response stating that in view of the district court's memorandum, he perceived no non-frivolous argument against the sentencing package.

Counsel nevertheless requested that Taylor be allowed an additional 30 days to research the issue himself. We never formally granted that request, but nevertheless, well over 30 days have passed with no response from Taylor forthcoming. Moreover, we agree with defense counsel that the district court's memorandum shows that the district court appreciated its discretion and exercised it appropriately. Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.