

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-2683

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Alan L. Goldsworth,

Appellant.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Appeal from the United States
District Court for the
Northern District of Iowa.

[UNPUBLISHED]

Submitted: August 7, 2007
Filed: August 10, 2007

Before BYE, RILEY, and MELLOY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Alan L. Goldsworth pleaded guilty to being a felon in possession of firearms, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1) and 924(e)(1). At sentencing, over Goldsworth's objection, the district court¹ ordered his 210-month prison sentence to run consecutively to an undischarged state prison sentence. He appeals, arguing the district court erred by failing to provide adequate reasons for the consecutive sentence. Reviewing the district court's decision to impose a consecutive sentence for

¹The Honorable Linda R. Reade, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa.

reasonableness, see United States v. Shafer, 438 F.3d 1225, 1227 (8th Cir. 2006), we affirm.

“In any . . . case involving an undischarged term of imprisonment, the sentence for the instant offense may be imposed to run concurrently, partially concurrently, or consecutively to the prior undischarged term of imprisonment to achieve a reasonable punishment for the instant offense.” U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3(c). The Guidelines commentary lists various factors that the district court should consider in determining a reasonable incremental punishment for the instant offense and in avoiding sentencing disparity, see U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3, comment. (n.3(A)); and to ensure proper appellate review, the court must explain its reasons for imposing a concurrent or consecutive sentence, see United States v. Winston, 456 F.3d 861, 867 (8th Cir. 2006).

The district court extensively explained its reasons for choosing the sentence that it did, which included its decision to impose a consecutive sentence. We conclude that the sentence was adequately explained and not unreasonable. See Winston, 456 F.3d at 868 (sentence was reasonable when court explained, citing § 3553(a) factors, why it was imposing consecutive sentence); United States v. Walker, 439 F.3d 890, 892 (8th Cir. 2006) (§ 3553(a) factors must be considered but need not be recited one by one).

Accordingly, we affirm.
