



2002 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

1-29-2002

USA v. Brown

Precedential or Non-Precedential:

Docket 1-1924

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002

Recommended Citation

"USA v. Brown" (2002). *2002 Decisions*. 54.
http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002/54

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2002 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

NON-PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 01-1924

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

STEVEN BROWN,

Appellant

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

(Dist. Court No. 95-92-03)
District Court Judge: Clarence C. Newcomer

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
January 17, 2002

Before: ALITO and ROTH, Circuit Judges, and SCHWARZER, Senior District
Judge.

(Opinion Filed: January 29, 2002)

MEMORANDUM OPINION OF THE COURT

PER CURIAM:

Because we write for the benefit of the parties, the background
of the appeal
is not set out.

We reject defendant's argument that he was entitled to a
downward

departure. Under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 35(b), a district court "may reduce a sentence to reflect a defendant's subsequent substantial assistance in investigating or prosecuting another person, in accordance with the guideline and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commissions under 28 U.S.C. § 994." The record is clear that the District Court gave due consideration to the assistance provided by the defendant, determined that he did not provide substantial assistance as required by Rule 35(b), and exercised its discretion to sentence the defendant within the appropriate range provided by the Sentencing Guidelines.

This Court lacks jurisdiction to review a district court's discretionary refusal to depart downward. See, e.g., *United States v. McBroom*, 124 F.3d 533, 541 n. 9 (3d Cir. 1997); *United States v. Mummert*, 34 F.3d 201, 205 (3d Cir. 1994). Accordingly, appellate jurisdiction is lacking, and we dismiss defendant's appeal.