IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-40075 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

HORACIO TREVINO-ALANIZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. B-98-CR-522-1

August 26, 1999

Before KING, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and DAVIS, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

Horacio Trevino-Alaniz ("Trevino") challenges his guiltyplea conviction for illegal reentry of a deported alien, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Trevino contends that the district court erred by failing to comply with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1) during rearraignment and that his conviction must therefore be reversed.

In reviewing whether the district court complied with the dictates of Rule 11, this court "conduct[s] a straightforward,

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

two-question `harmless error' analysis: (1) Did the sentencing court in fact vary from the procedures required by Rule 11, and (2) if so, did such variance affect substantial rights of the defendant?" <u>United States v. Johnson</u>, 1 F.3d 296, 298 (5th Cir. 1993) (en banc); <u>see Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(h)</u>. Although Trevino acknowledges that Rule 11 violations are subject to harmlesserror review, he makes no argument that his substantial rights were affected by the district court's alleged violation of Rule 11(c)(1). Accordingly, there is no reversible error, <u>see</u> Johnson, 1 F.3d at 298, and Trevino's appeal is frivolous.

Furthermore, while Trevino's argument that the district court failed to explain the charge to him is not frivolous, it is meritless. As the charge in this case was simple, a reading of the indictment, followed by an opportunity given to the defendant to ask questions about it, was sufficient. <u>United States v.</u> <u>Dayton</u>, 604 F.2d 931, 937 (5th Cir. 1979) (en banc).

Because Trevino's appeal is without merit and is frivolous, it is DISMISSED. 5th Cir. R. 42.2. The Government's motion to consolidate this case is DENIED.

APPEAL DISMISSED; MOTION DENIED.