

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 26-50205
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 23, 2026

Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

RIGOBERTO SANTOS-QUINTERO,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 2:25-CR-2012-1

Before SMITH, SOUTHWICK, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Rigoberto Santos-Quintero appeals his sentence for illegal reentry. He maintains that the district court failed to give sufficient reasons for imposing a 30-month, above-guidelines sentence; that his sentence is substantively unreasonable; that the court erred by imposing various sex-offender-related special conditions of supervised release; and that the court failed to give an adequate explanation for those conditions.

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

No. 26-50205

Santos-Quintero's challenge to the adequacy of reasons for his sentence, which we review for plain error, fails. *See United States v. Mondragon-Santiago*, 564 F.3d 357, 364–65 (5th Cir. 2009). The court articulated specific, individualized reasons, tied to pertinent 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and Santos-Quintero's history of removals and criminal conduct. Santos-Quintero shows no clear or obvious error, *see United States v. Lopez-Velasquez*, 526 F.3d 804, 807 (5th Cir. 2008), nor a reasonable probability that further explanation would have resulted in a lesser sentence, *see Mondragon-Santiago*, 564 F.3d at 364–65. Santos-Quintero's preserved substantive-reasonableness argument is likewise unavailing. *See Lopez-Velasquez*, 526 F.3d at 807; *United States v. Smith*, 440 F.3d 704, 708–09 (5th Cir. 2006).

The presentence report supports a conclusion that the sex-offender-related conditions are reasonably related to, at the least, Santos-Quintero's history and characteristics. *See United States v. Salazar*, 743 F.3d 445, 451 (5th Cir. 2014). Finally, although the district court did not provide a lengthy explanation for imposing the conditions of supervised release, the reasoning is clear from the record. *See id.*; *see also United States v. Caravayo*, 809 F.3d 269, 275 (5th Cir. 2015).

AFFIRMED.