

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-40715

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 10, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

RESHON LAMONT SCOTT,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:09-CR-15-1

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

PER CURIAM:*

Reshon Lamont Scott appeals the 60-month sentence imposed upon the revocation of his supervised release. Scott contends that the district court impermissibly considered the retributive factors in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A) when fashioning his revocation sentence. Because Scott did not preserve this issue, our review is for plain error. *See Puckett v. United States*, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009).

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

No. 24-40715

While Scott acknowledges that review is for plain error, he offers no plain-error analysis. Regrettably, Scott's counsel neither objected below, nor offered comprehensive briefing in support of his position. He neither contends nor shows that the district court clearly or obviously erred by considering any factors in § 3553(a)(2)(A), and he fails to mention or address the third and fourth prongs of plain error review. *See Puckett*, 556 U.S. at 135. He consequently has waived these issues by failing to brief them. *See United States v. Reagan*, 596 F.3d 251, 254 (5th Cir. 2010). As a result, Scott has not satisfied his burden of showing that all four prongs of the plain error standard have been met. *See Puckett*, 556 U.S. at 135; *United States v. Lavalais*, 960 F.3d 180, 186 (5th Cir. 2020).

AFFIRMED.