

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

January 4, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 21-50255  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

MARCELINO ESTEBAN MEDINA-CASTILLO,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 5:20-CR-481-1

---

Before JOLLY, WILLETT, and ENGELHARDT, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Marcelino Esteban Medina-Castillo pleaded guilty to one count of illegal reentry, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(1), and was sentenced within the guidelines range to 37 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release. On appeal, he argues that the district court

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.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. 21-50255

plainly erred by failing to provide him with various admonishments required by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(b)(1), at his arraignment hearing.

Because Medina-Castillo did not raise any Rule 11 issues in the district court, our review is limited to plain error. *See United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 58-59 (2002). To show plain error, Medina-Castillo must show a forfeited error that is clear or obvious and that affects his substantial rights. *See Puckett v. United States*, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009). If he makes such a showing, we have the discretion to correct the error but will do so only if it seriously affects the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of judicial proceedings. *See id.*

In order to demonstrate that an error affected his substantial rights, Medina-Castillo must show that there is a “reasonable probability” that he would not have pleaded guilty “but for the error.” *United States v. Dominguez Benitez*, 542 U.S. 74, 76 (2004). In analyzing whether a defendant’s substantial rights were affected, we examine the entire record. *Id.* Assuming that Medina-Castillo has shown that the district court’s omission of various admonishments required by Rule 11(b)(1) were clear or obvious errors, he has failed to establish that such errors affected his substantial rights. *See id.*

The judgment is AFFIRMED.