

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

February 7, 2011

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 10-30494  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

RONNIE R. PEA, also known as Lil Sam,

Defendant-Appellant

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 5:09-CR-207-2

---

Before REAVLEY, DENNIS, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Ronnie R. Pea appeals his guilty-plea conviction and sentence for conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine and possession of a firearm during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime. He argues that the district court erred when it failed to adequately inform him of the mandatory minimum sentence as required by FED. R. CRIM. P. 11(b)(1)(I). Where, as here, a defendant fails to object to a Rule 11 error in the district court, this court reviews for plain error. *United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 59 (2002).

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 10-30494

The PSR correctly advised Pea of the sentence that he faced and his discussions with counsel at the plea hearing, as well as his objections to the PSR, indicated his knowledge that his sentences for the two counts to which he pleaded guilty were to be served consecutively. Additionally, Pea's awareness that he faced a mandatory minimum sentence of 25 years of imprisonment was evident in a letter that he submitted to the district court prior to sentencing. The fact that Pea did not attempt to withdraw his guilty plea despite this knowledge suggests that the court's failure to clearly inform him of the mandatory minimum sentence was not a significant factor in his decision to plead guilty. *See United States v. Johnson*, 1 F.3d 296, 302 (5th Cir. 1993) (en banc). Considering the record as a whole, *Vonn*, 535 U.S. at 68, we find that Pea has not established plain error. *See United States v. Dominguez Benitez*, 542 U.S. 74, 76 (2004); *United States v. Davis*, 602 F.3d 643, 650-52 (5th Cir. 2010).

AFFIRMED.