

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-50878
CONSOLIDATED WITH
No. 25-50880
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 7, 2026

Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

EDSON ALEXIS CARRIZAL,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC Nos. 2:25-CR-543-1,
2:25-CR-1432-1

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Edson Alexis Carrizal pleaded guilty to illegal reentry into the United States, 8 U.S.C. § 1326, and received an above-guidelines sentence of 72 months of imprisonment. His supervised release from a prior illegal reentry

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

25-50878
c/w No. 25-50880

offense was also revoked resulting in an additional revocation sentence of 14 months of imprisonment to be served consecutively to his 72-month sentence. Carrizal now challenges the procedural and substantive reasonableness of his sentence, arguing that the district court (1) procedurally erred by failing to explain its reasons for the upward variance and (2) imposed a substantively unreasonable sentence. Additionally, he challenges the substantive reasonableness of the revocation sentence.

Carrizal argues that the district court procedurally erred by failing to adequately explain its reasons for the upward variance. We conclude that the district court did not plainly err because it cited appropriate 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and gave reasons tied to those factors. *See United States v. Key*, 599 F.3d 469, 474 (5th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Smith*, 440 F.3d 704, 707-08 (5th Cir. 2006).

While Carrizal argues that the sentence was greater than necessary, he has not shown that the sentence “(1) does not account for a factor that should have received significant weight, (2) gives significant weight to an irrelevant or improper factor, or (3) represents a clear error of judgment in balancing the sentencing factors.” *Smith*, 440 F.3d at 708. Therefore, he has not shown that the above-guidelines sentence was substantively unreasonable. *See id.*; *United States v. Lopez-Velasquez*, 526 F.3d 804, 805-08 (5th Cir. 2008).

Lastly, we review the reasonableness of the revocation sentence using the two-step plainly unreasonable standard. *See United States v. Cano*, 981 F.3d 422, 425 (5th Cir. 2020). Carrizal has not shown that his consecutive revocation sentence was plainly unreasonable. *See id.*; *Lopez-Velasquez*, 526 F.3d at 809.

AFFIRMED.