NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 16-50502
Plaintiff-Appellee,	D.C. No. 3:05-cr-00200-BEN
v.	
DARCY PASCHALL,	MEMORANDUM*
Defendant-Appellant.	

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Roger T. Benitez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 26, 2017**

Before: PAEZ, BEA, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Darcy Paschall appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges the

six-month custodial sentence and 51-month term of supervision imposed upon

revocation of supervised release. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291,

and we affirm.

---

*   This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

**   The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision
without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Paschall contends that the district court procedurally erred by failing to respond to her nonfrivolous argument in favor of leniency. We review for plain error, *see United States v. Valencia-Barragan*, 608 F.3d 1103, 1108 (9th Cir. 2010), and conclude that there was none. The record reflects that the district court considered Paschall's argument and adequately explained its reasons for imposing the sentence selected. *See Rita v. United States*, 551 U.S. 338, 358-59 (2007).

Paschall also contends that the 51-month term of supervised release is substantively unreasonable in light of the district court's willingness to terminate supervision in two years if Paschall remains violation-free. The district court did not abuse its discretion. *See Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). The term of supervised release is substantively reasonable in light of the 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e) sentencing factors and the totality of the circumstances, including Paschall's history of drug and alcohol abuse. *See Gall*, 552 U.S. at 51.

AFFIRMED.