

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-30710
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 25, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

FELICIA SALVADOR,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 5:25-CR-21-1

Before STEWART, RICHMAN, and HIGGINSON, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Felicia Salvador appeals the 168-month sentence imposed following her guilty plea conviction for conspiracy to distribute and to possess with intent to distribute 50 grams or more of methamphetamine. She argues the district court erred in denying a mitigating role reduction under the amended

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-30710

U.S.S.G. § 3B1.2. The Government argues the district court did not err in denying the reduction and, in the alternative, any error was harmless.

We review a district court's interpretation and application of the Guidelines de novo and its factual findings, including its finding that a defendant was not a minor participant, for clear error. *United States v. Sanchez-Villarreal*, 857 F.3d 714, 721 (5th Cir. 2017). If a finding of fact is plausible in view of the record as a whole, it is not clearly erroneous. *Id.*

The record supports the Government's harmless error argument. In her objections to the presentence report, Salvador argued that the correct advisory guidelines range should have been 57 to 71 months of imprisonment, but she acknowledged that there was a 10-year statutory mandatory minimum sentence under 21 U.S.C. § 841(b)(1)(A)(viii). At sentencing, the district court heard Salvador's argument for a mitigating role reduction, overruled her objection, and found that she acted as a facilitator in distributing large drug quantities. It determined that the advisory guidelines range was correctly calculated, but it stated that it would impose the same 168-month sentence regardless, based on the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and understanding "the difficulties of applying the amended section in the guidelines as discussed in great detail." Therefore, any error in denying the mitigating role adjustment was harmless. *See United States v. Giglio*, 126 F.4th 1039, 1046-47 (5th Cir. 2025) *see also United States v. Medel-Guadalupe*, 987 F.3d 424, 429 (5th Cir. 2021).

AFFIRMED.