

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 24 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KARLOS ARIEL RAMOS-BLANCO,

Defendant - Appellant.

Nos. 26-1711, 26-1712

D.C. Nos.

2:25-cr-01628-KML-1

2:25-cr-00816-KML-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Krissa M. Lanham, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 22, 2026**

Before: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated appeals, Karlos Ariel Ramos-Blanco appeals from his guilty-plea conviction and 12-month-and-one-day sentence for reentry of a removed alien in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326, and the revocation of his supervised

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

release and consecutive 3-month sentence imposed upon revocation.

Ramos-Blanco's counsel filed a brief under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no non-frivolous arguments for appeal. Ramos-Blanco has not filed a pro se supplemental brief.

The record reflects that Ramos-Blanco entered into a global plea agreement resolving both his illegal reentry offense and his supervised release violation. By the terms of that agreement, Ramos-Blanco waived his right to appeal his illegal reentry conviction and sentence. Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), discloses no non-frivolous issue as to whether the appeal waiver is enforceable. *See United States v. Watson*, 582 F.3d 974, 986-88 (9th Cir. 2009). We therefore dismiss Appeal No. 26-1711. *See id.* at 988.

In Appeal No. 26-1712, our independent review of the record under *Penson* discloses no non-frivolous arguments to be made on direct appeal as to the revocation of supervised release or the sentence. We therefore affirm this appeal.

We remand to the district court, however, with instructions to correct the record. The plea agreement at Docket Entry No. 32 on the district court docket appears to be from Ramos-Blanco's prior illegal reentry case. The global plea agreement that the court accepted in these proceedings is at Docket Entry No. 14 and is not signed by the court. We remand for the district court to sign that plea

agreement and take any other action necessary to correct the record.

Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.

APPEAL NO. 26-1711 DISMISSED and REMANDED with instructions.

APPEAL NO. 26-1712 AFFIRMED.