

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

No. 18-40162
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 17, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

CONRADO DEPAZ ARELLANO,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 6:17-CR-60-1

Before WIENER, SOUTHWICK, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Defendant-Appellant Conrado Depaz Arellano appeals his sentences for conspiracy to possess a controlled substance with intent to distribute and illegal reentry following removal. He contends that the district court erred when it failed to orally pronounce the special conditions of supervised release included in his written judgment. In a supplemental letter brief, Depaz Arellano concedes that his case appears analogous to *United States v. Diggles*,

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-40162

957 F.3d 551 (5th Cir. 2020) (en banc), and he seeks to preserve this issue for further appellate review.

Depaz Arellano did not object when the district court orally adopted the conditions outlined in the presentence report (PSR), which included the three conditions he now challenges. Consequently, plain error review applies. *Diggles*, 957 F.3d at 559-60, 563. Because the district court’s oral adoption of the conditions in the PSR satisfied the court’s pronouncement obligations to the extent it was required to do so, Depaz Arellano does “not clear even the first of the four plain-error hurdles for there was no error at all.” *Id.* at 560.

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.