United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

December 12, 2005

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-50146

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

SILVESTRE CUELLAR

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas (03-CR-1087)

ON REMAND FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Before HIGGINBOTHAM and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:**

In our previous opinion in this case, we affirmed Defendant-Appellant's conviction and sentence. <u>See United States v. Cuellar</u>, No. 04-50146, 105 Fed. Appx. 617 (5th Cir. 2004) (per curiam) (unpublished). Following our judgment, Cuellar filed a petition

^{*} This appeal is being decided by a quorum due to the retirement of Judge Pickering. 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

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 R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5^{TH} CIR.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

for certiorari. The Supreme Court granted Cuellar's petition for certiorari, vacated our judgment, and remanded the case to this court for further consideration in light of <u>United States v.</u> <u>Booker</u>, 125 S. Ct. 738 (2005). We now reconsider the matter in light of <u>Booker</u> and decide to reinstate our previous judgment affirming Cuellar's conviction and sentence.

Cuellar raised a <u>Booker</u>-related challenge to his sentence for the first time on direct appeal. Because Cuellar never raised a <u>Booker</u> objection in trial court, however, the claim would fail under the plain-error test discussed in <u>United States v. Mares</u>, 402 F.3d 511, 520-22 (5th Cir. 2005). The district court sentenced Cuellar at the bottom of the guideline range, but gave no indication it would have imposed a lesser sentence had the guidelines been advisory. <u>See United States v. Bringier</u>, 405 F.3d 310 (5th Cir. 2005).

For the reasons stated above, our prior disposition remains in effect, and we REINSTATE OUR EARLIER JUDGMENT affirming Cuellar's conviction and sentence.

-2-