

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 14, 2026

Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

No. 26-30089
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

NORVELL HARRIS,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 2:24-CR-82-1

Before JONES, HO, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Norvell Harris appeals his conviction and sentence for two counts of possession of a controlled substance with intent to distribute. He challenges the district court's denial of two motions, a motion to suppress evidence and a motion for a hearing under *Franks v. Delaware*, 438 U.S. 154 (1978), and he argues that the court erred in calculating the guidelines range at sentencing.

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

No. 26-30089

As the Government argues, the briefing of Harris's challenge to the denial of his suppression motion is inadequate. *See United States v. Scroggins*, 599 F.3d 433, 446-47 (5th Cir. 2010). Harris merely intimates possible grounds for relief and largely ignores the reasoning of the district court. This issue has therefore been abandoned. *See id.*

Harris's challenge to the denial of his motion for a *Franks* hearing is unavailing as well. Most of the district court's findings are not meaningfully disputed, and Harris fails to show that the court clearly erred in concluding that an acknowledged error was not deliberate or made with reckless disregard for the truth. *See United States v. Thomas*, 627 F.3d 146, 159 (5th Cir. 2010).

To the extent Harris has adequately briefed the argument that the district court should have applied an older version of the Guidelines because doing so would have resulted in a lower guidelines range, the argument fails. *See United States v. Vargas*, 74 F.4th 673, 680-90 (5th Cir. 2023) (en banc). We also reject his challenge to the district court's application of U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(b)(1), which he does not show to be clearly erroneous. *See United States v. Romans*, 823 F.3d 299, 317 (5th Cir. 2016).

Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.