

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 26-30100
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 14, 2026

Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

JACLEMMIE CROSBY,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 5:25-CR-247-1

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

PER CURIAM:*

JaClemmie Crosby pleaded guilty to possession of a firearm by a felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1), and he was sentenced above the applicable guidelines range to 60 months of imprisonment. He now challenges the procedural and substantive reasonableness of his sentence, arguing that the district court (1) failed to explain its reasons for the upward

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

No. 26-30100

variance and (2) misbalanced the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors and failed to consider mitigating factors.

First, with respect to Crosby's claim of procedural error, 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. Fraga*, 704 F.3d 432, 438-39 (5th Cir. 2013); *United States v. Key*, 599 F.3d 469, 473 (5th Cir. 2010). Because the "record makes the sentencing judge's reasoning clear and allows for effective review[,] no further explanation was required." *Fraga*, 704 F.3d at 439.

As to the substantive reasonableness of the sentence, in considering the totality of the circumstances, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion because it relied on appropriate 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors to support the upward variance. *See United States v. Chiasson*, 90 F.4th 832, 836 (5th Cir. 2024); *United States v. Vargas*, 21 F.4th 332, 337 (5th Cir. 2021); *Key*, 599 F.3d at 475. Therefore, Crosby has not demonstrated 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." *United States v. Smith*, 440 F.3d 704, 708 (5th Cir. 2006).

Given the foregoing, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.