

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

---

No. 16-11538  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**  
November 10, 2017

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff–Appellee,

versus

JEFFREY BLAKE ELLIS, Also Known as “Jealous”,

Defendant–Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
No. 4:16-CR-121-2

---

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and SMITH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Jeffrey Ellis was convicted of one charge of conspiring to possess

---

\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 16-11538

methamphetamine with intent to distribute and was sentenced to 240 months in prison and a three-year term of supervised release. He maintains that the district court erred by denying him the sentencing adjustment for acceptance of responsibility and imposing the adjustment for obstruction of justice.

Ellis has shown no clear error in connection with the imposition of the U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1 adjustment for obstruction of justice. *See United States v. Juarez-Duarte*, 513 F.3d 204, 208 (5th Cir. 2008). The presentence report, on which the district court was entitled to rely, set forth facts leading to a reasonable inference that Ellis had tried to intimidate a codefendant. *See United States v. Alaniz*, 726 F.3d 586, 619 (5th Cir. 2013); *United States v. Caldwell*, 448 F.3d 287, 290 (5th Cir. 2006). In light of those facts, the conclusion that Ellis obstructed justice is plausible and is not clearly erroneous. *See Juarez-Duarte*, 513 F.3d at 208; U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1, comment.(n.4(A)). Ellis also has not shown that his is the exceptional case in which a defendant who receives the § 3C1.1 adjustment for obstruction of justice should also receive the U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(a) reduction for acceptance of responsibility. *See United States v. Chung*, 261 F.3d 536, 540 (5th Cir. 2001).

AFFIRMED.