

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 18-11280  
\_\_\_\_\_

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

October 11, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

JAMAL MARQUISE COLLINS,

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:18-CR-75-1  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before JOLLY, GRAVES, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Jamal Marquise Collins appeals the sentence imposed for his conviction of unlawful possession of a firearm by a felon. According to Collins, the district court improperly considered a bare arrest record in sentencing him.

Plain error review applies to this procedural issue. Collins's general objection to the substantive and procedural reasonableness of his sentence was not sufficient to alert the district court of any error regarding the bare arrest

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-11280

record. *See United States v. Wooley*, 740 F.3d 359, 367 (5th Cir. 2014); *United States v. Williams*, 620 F.3d 483, 493 (5th Cir. 2010).

The district court's comments at sentencing do not necessarily establish that it considered the bare arrest record. Its comments are, at worst, ambiguous regarding consideration of the bare arrest record. If there were any error in the district court's comments, the error was not of the clear or obvious type required by the plain error standard. *See United States v. Ibarra-Zelaya*, 465 F.3d 596, 607 (5th Cir. 2006).

AFFIRMED.