Case: 21-10627 Document: 00516209717 Page: 1 Date Filed: 02/21/2022

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

No. 21-10627 Summary Calendar February 21, 2022 Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

United States of America,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

OSCAR GEOVANNY CAMPOS,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas USDC No. 4:21-CR-18-1

Before Jolly, Willett, and Engelhardt, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Oscar Geovanny Campos appeals the 37-month prison term imposed upon his conviction for illegal reentry. He concedes that the district court provided adequate reasons to support the prison term but asserts that the court was further obligated under Rita v. United States, 551 U.S. 338 (2007),

^{*} Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 21-10627

to specifically address his nonfrivolous arguments for a sentence of 30 months. We review this forfeited objection for plain error. *See United States* v. *Coto-Mendoza*, 986 F.3d 583, 585-86 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 142 S. Ct. 207 (2021).

The record as a whole reflects that the district court considered Campos's arguments concerning his reasons for returning to the United States and his plan to remain in El Salvador and work in construction upon his release from prison. The court's stated explanation for the withinguidelines sentence provided a reasoned basis for it. Accordingly, the court did not err by failing to reference each of Campos's arguments. *See Rita*, 551 U.S. at 343-45, 356, 358-59; *Coto-Mendoza*, 986 F.3d at 584, 586-87 & nn.4-6; *United States v. Becerril-Pena*, 714 F.3d 347, 351-52 (5th Cir. 2013). The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

The Government's motion for summary affirmance is DENIED as MOOT. See Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969). In the interest of judicial economy, the alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief on the merits is DENIED as MOOT.