

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

---

No. 18-10852  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

May 31, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

RONALD FRANK LEE,

Defendant-Appellant

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:17-CR-268-1

---

Before DENNIS, CLEMENT, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Ronald Frank Lee pleaded guilty to one count of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, and he received a sentence of 24 months in prison, to be followed by a three-year term of supervised release. On appeal, he argues that the district court plainly erred by imposing a condition of supervised release requiring that he “permit a probation officer to visit [him] at any time at home

---

\* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-10852

or elsewhere and permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view of the probation officer.”

As Lee concedes, because the argument is raised for the first time on appeal, review is for plain error. *See United States v. Salazar*, 743 F.3d 445, 448 (5th Cir. 2014). To demonstrate plain error, he must show a forfeited error that is clear or obvious and that affects his substantial rights. *Puckett v. United States*, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009). If Lee makes such a showing, this court has the discretion to correct the error but should do so only if it seriously affects the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of judicial proceedings. *Id.* Lee has not satisfied this standard. *See United States v. Cabello*, 916 F.3d 543, 544 (5th Cir. 2019). Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.