

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

---

No. 19-20340  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

January 8, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

JAGDISHKUMAR CHAUDHARI, also known as Jagdish,

Defendant - Appellant

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:16-CR-385-26

---

Before BARKSDALE, HAYNES, and ENGELHARDT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Jagdishkumar Chaudhari appeals his guilty-plea conviction and sentence for conspiracy to commit money laundering, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956(a)(1)(B)(i) and 1956(h). The district court sentenced him to, *inter alia*, 108 months' imprisonment. Chaudhari, however, contends only that he received ineffective assistance of counsel at sentencing because his attorney

---

\* Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Cir. R. 47.5.4.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. 19-20340

failed to object to the court’s claimed incorrect calculation of the advisory Sentencing Guidelines sentencing range.

Because trial records “may contain no evidence of alleged errors of omission, much less the reasons underlying them”, the preferred method for resolving ineffective-assistance claims is by a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, not a direct appeal. *Massaro v. United States*, 538 U.S. 500, 504–05 (2003). Review on direct appeal, however, is appropriate in the “rare case[]” whose record provides details about his attorney’s “conduct and motivations”. *United States v. Isgar*, 739 F.3d 829, 841 (5th Cir. 2014) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

The record in this instance provides no details about why Chaudhari’s attorney failed to object. Accordingly, we decline to consider his claim, without prejudice to his right to pursue it pursuant to § 2255.

AFFIRMED.