

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-13398

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT MARCH 29, 2011 JOHN LEY CLERK

D. C. Docket No. 08-21149-CR-DMM

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

DANIEL ENRIQUE MARIN,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida

(March 29, 2011)

Before BARKETT, HULL and KRAVITCH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Enrique Marin appeals his convictions and 96-month concurrent sentences after a jury found him guilty of obstruction of justice, in violation of 18

U.S.C. § 1503, and attempted witness tampering, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(b)(1). The jury found that, while awaiting trial on federal money laundering and drug trafficking charges, Marin threatened his co-defendant's family in order to prevent his co-defendant from testifying against him. On appeal, Marin raises seven issues pertaining to his convictions and sentences.¹ We have carefully considered the record and the parties' arguments, and having the benefit of oral argument, we find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm Marin's convictions and sentences. However, we remand for the limited purpose of correcting a clerical error in the judgment; while the district court orally sentenced Marin to two concurrent 96-month sentences, the judgment of conviction does not reflect that two sentences were imposed concurrently.

AFFIRMED; REMANDED FOR CORRECTION OF JUDGMENT.

¹ Specifically, Marin argues that: 1) the district court improperly limited his examination of prospective jurors during voir dire; 2) upon finding a speedy trial violation, the district court should have dismissed the original indictment with prejudice, not without prejudice; 3) various errors committed during trial and closing argument constituted cumulative error; 4) the district court erroneously denied his post-trial motions for new trial and production of evidence; 5) the district court erred in its jury instructions; 6) the evidence was insufficient to support his convictions; and 7) the district court improperly relied on acquitted conduct at sentencing.