United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 16, 2007

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-40889 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

VERSUS

RUBEN RODRIGUEZ-CUEVAS,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court For the Southern District of Texas, Laredo USDC No. 5:05-CR-98-ALL

ON REMAND FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Before JONES, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and DAVIS, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

This court previously affirmed the conviction and sentence of the Appellant Ruben Rodriguez-Cuevas ("Cuevas"). On December 11, 2006, the Supreme Court vacated and remanded the case for reconsideration in light of <u>Lopez v. Gonzalez</u>, 127 S. Ct. 625 (2006).

In light of <u>Lopez</u>, the district court erred by enhancing Cuevas's sentence based on a state conviction for possession of

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

methamphetamine. Because Cuevas has completed the confinement portion of his sentence, any argument that the prison term should be reduced is moot and the only portion of the sentence remaining for consideration is the defendant's term of supervised release.

However, as the Federal Public Defender notes, Cuevas presumably has been deported. In order to resentence the defendant to correct the error and reduce the defendant's term of supervised release, FEDERAL RULE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 43 requires the defendant to be present and have the opportunity to allocute. Because the defendant has been deported and is legally unable, without permission of the Attorney General, to reenter the United States to be present for a resentencing proceeding, there is no relief we are able to grant Cuevas and his appeal is moot. <u>See United States v.</u> <u>Rosenbaum-Alanis</u>, No. 05-41400, 2007 WL 926832 (5th Cir. March 29, 2007). The appeal is therefore **DISMISSED**.

2