

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 26-30155
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 19, 2026

Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

QUINTERRIUS D. BROWN,

Defendant—Appellant,

CONSOLIDATED WITH

No. 26-30168

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

QUINTERRIUS BROWN,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana

USDC Nos. 5:21-CR-159-1,
5:23-CR-108-10

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

PER CURIAM:*

Quinterrius Brown appeals the concurrent 21-month revocation sentences imposed after the revocation of his supervised release following his convictions for illegal receipt of a firearm by a person under indictment and conspiracy to commit wire fraud. He argues that the district court abused its discretion by improperly considering 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A) and by imposing a substantively excessive sentence. Because Brown did not raise these arguments in the district court, the plain error standard of review applies. *See United States v. Cano*, 981 F.3d 422, 425 (5th Cir. 2020).

None of the court's statements at the revocation hearing reflect express or unmistakable reliance on the § 3553(a)(2)(A) factors. *See Esteras v. United States*, 606 U.S. 185, 202-03 (2025). The district court based the revocation sentence on Brown's repeated violations and imposed the sentence to satisfy the need for adequate deterrence and to sanction Brown's breach of the court's trust, both permissible considerations. *See Cano*, 981 F.3d at 426. He has not shown the district court clearly or obviously erred by relying on impermissible sentencing factors. *See Esteras*, 606 U.S. at 203.

The district court understood the sentence imposed was a variance and explained the sentence was based on Brown's failure to make an effort to comply with his conditions, his disregard for rehabilitation, and his consistent noncompliance. He has not shown that the sentence "(1) does not account for a factor that should have received significant weight, (2) gives significant

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

26-30155
c/w No. 26-30168

weight to an irrelevant or improper factor, or (3) represents a clear error of judgment in balancing the sentencing factors.” *United States v. Warren*, 720 F.3d 321, 332 (5th Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Further, we routinely uphold revocation sentences in excess of the advisory range but within the statutory maximum term allowed for the revocation sentence. *See United States v. Sanchez*, 900 F.3d 678, 685 (5th Cir. 2018); *United States v. Kippers*, 685 F.3d 491, 500-01 (5th Cir. 2012).

AFFIRMED.