

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

No. 13-51157
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED
December 23, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

FELIPE SAUCEDO, III,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 2:08-CR-653-1

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Felipe Saucedo, III, has appealed the district court's judgment revoking his supervised release and sentencing him to a 24-month term of imprisonment. He contends that the sentence imposed was greater than necessary to fulfill the sentencing objectives of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) and was, therefore, unreasonable.

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 13-51157

Ordinarily, revocation sentences are reviewed under a “plainly unreasonable” standard. *United States v. Miller*, 634 F.3d 841, 843 (5th Cir. 2011). However, because no objection was made at the revocation hearing, this court’s review of Saucedo’s revocation sentence is limited to plain error. *See United States v. Whitelaw*, 580 F.3d 256, 259-60 (5th Cir. 2009). To show plain error, Saucedo must show a forfeited error that is clear or obvious and that affects his substantial rights. *See Puckett v. United States*, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009). If he makes such a showing, this court has the discretion to correct the error but only if it seriously affects the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of judicial proceedings. *See id.*

Saucedo does not dispute that the district court imposed a statutory maximum sentence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3). The court considered the guidelines policy statements and appropriate statutory sentencing factors. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B); *United States v. Mathena*, 23 F.3d 87, 90-93 (5th Cir. 1994). No error, plain or otherwise, has been identified. The judgment is AFFIRMED.