

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-50948
CONSOLIDATED WITH
No. 25-50949
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit
FILED
September 11, 2026
Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

ODILON SANCHEZ-ROMERO,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC Nos. 2:23-CR-2580-1, 2:23-CR-2917-1

Before KING, HIGGINSON, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Odilon Sanchez-Romero appeals the sentence imposed following his conviction for illegal reentry and the consecutive sentence imposed upon the revocation of his term of supervised release. He argues that the district court did not adequately explain its choice of sentence for his illegal reentry offense

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

25-50948
c/w No. 25-50949

or its decision to impose consecutive sentences. Moreover, he challenges the substantive reasonableness of the sentence for his illegal reentry offense and asserts that the district court erred by ordering a supervised release term on a deportable alien without an individualized determination that supervision was necessary. Sanchez-Romero also suggests that the district court erred by conducting a joint sentencing hearing involving other defendants.

Sanchez-Romero has not shown reversible plain error as to his claims that the district court did not sufficiently explain its sentencing decisions. *See United States v. Coto-Mendoza*, 986 F.3d 583, 585-86 (5th Cir. 2021); *United States v. Mondragon-Santiago*, 564 F.3d 360, 364-65 (5th Cir. 2009). Even if we assume for the sake of argument that the district court did not provide adequate reasons for its sentencing choices, Sanchez-Romero has failed to demonstrate that this affected his substantial rights. *See Coto-Mendoza*, 986 F.3d 583, 585-86; *United States v. Izaguirre-Losoya*, 219 F.3d 437, 440-42 (5th Cir. 2000).

Further, he has not rebutted the presumption of reasonableness that applies to the within-guidelines sentence imposed for his illegal reentry offense. *See United States v. Vargas*, 21 F.4th 332, 334, 337 (5th Cir. 2021). The district court, which was in a superior position to decide the significance and relevance of particular factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), *see United States v. Hernandez*, 633 F.3d 370, 375 (5th Cir. 2011), implicitly gave less weight to the mitigating factors identified by Sanchez-Romero than other factors when choosing the within-guidelines sentence, *see United States v. Bailentia*, 717 F.3d 448, 450 (5th Cir. 2013). Sanchez-Romero has not shown that the sentence failed to account for a factor that should have received significant weight, gave significant weight to an irrelevant or improper factor, or represented a clear error of judgment in balancing the factors. *See Vargas*, 21 F.4th at 337.

25-50948
c/w No. 25-50949

His argument that the district court reversibly erred in its imposition of a term of supervised release on a deportable alien is unavailing. Sanchez-Romero has not shown that any error in the district court's imposition of a supervised release term on a deportable alien affected his substantial rights. *See United States v. Cancino-Trinidad*, 710 F.3d 601, 605 (5th Cir. 2013).

Finally, his claim that the group sentencing hearing was procedurally unreasonable and unconstitutional is unavailing. He has failed to show any reversible plain error. *See Mondragon-Santiago*, 564 F.3d at 361.

AFFIRMED.