

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

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

September 6, 2013

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 12-40663  
\_\_\_\_\_

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

CARLOS ARIAGA-PASTRANA, also known as Carlos Arriaga-Pastrana,

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 5:11-CR-1372-1  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before DAVIS and JONES, Circuit Judges, and MILAZZO\*, District Judge.

PER CURIAM:\*\*

Carlos Ariaga-Pastrana pleaded guilty to illegal reentry by a deported alien. The district court imposed a 41-month sentence for this offense, to be followed by a one-year term of supervised release. On appeal, Ariaga-Pastrana challenges the procedural and substantive reasonableness of his supervised release term on the grounds that the district court did not explain why it imposed a term of supervised release and the court did not account for the fact

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* District Judge of the Eastern District of Louisiana, sitting by designation.

\*\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 12-40663

that he is a deportable alien, a factor that, he contends, should have received significant weight. Because Ariaga-Pastrana did not raise these issues or object to his sentence in the district court, we review for plain error only. *See United States v. Dominguez-Alvarado*, 695 F.3d 324, 328-29 (5th Cir. 2012).

If the defendant is an alien who is likely to be deported after serving a prison sentence, supervised release is not ordinarily imposed and “should not be imposed absent a determination that supervised release would provide an added measure of deterrence and protection based on the facts and circumstances of a particular case.” *Id.* at 329; *see* U.S.S.G. § 5D1.1, comment. (n.5). Here, the district court did not explain why it chose to impose a supervised release term. Nonetheless, the record does not suggest that if the court had explained the sentence in greater detail it would have concluded that supervised release was unwarranted. Moreover, given Ariaga-Pastrana’s history of illegally reentering the United States within a short time of being deported, he is unable to show that any error, if left uncorrected, would seriously affect the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of the judicial proceedings. *See Puckett v. United States*, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009). Accordingly, Ariaga-Pastrana has not shown that the district court committed reversible plain error by not adequately explaining its decision to order a supervised release term.

As for substantive reasonableness, Ariaga-Pastrana’s one-year supervised release term was within the advisory guidelines range, and Ariaga-Pastrana has not overcome the inference that the district court considered the relevant factors in imposing this sentence. *See United States v. Mares*, 402 F.3d 511, 519 (5th Cir. 2005). Accordingly, he has not established that the court plainly erred in imposing supervised release. The judgment of the district court is thus **AFFIRMED**.