NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

NOV 3 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff - Appellee, v. MIRANDA KAY REA, Defendant - Appellant.	No. 26-651 D.C. No. 3:20-cr-01992-JLS-1 MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Janis L. Sammartino, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 27, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, FORREST, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Miranda Kay Rea appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges the 30-month sentence imposed upon the revocation of her supervised release. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Rea first contends that the district court procedurally erred by (1) imposing

* 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).

the sentence for rehabilitative purposes, (2) failing to consider adequately the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors and her mitigating arguments, and (3) failing to explain the sentence sufficiently. Contrary to Rea's assertion, we review these claims for plain error. *See United States v. Grissom*, 525 F.3d 691, 694 (9th Cir. 2008). However, they fail under any standard of review. The record does not support Rea's claim that the court imposed the sentence to promote her rehabilitation. *See Tapia v. United States*, 564 U.S. 319, 334 (2011) ("A court commits no error by discussing the opportunities for rehabilitation within prison."). Moreover, the court's explanation for the sentence made clear that it believed Rea's breach of the court's trust warranted a significant sentence, *see United States v. Simtob*, 485 F.3d 1058, 1062 (9th Cir. 2007), with some credit for her mitigating circumstances. This explanation, which reflects the court's consideration of the sentencing factors and Rea's arguments, was sufficient. *See United States v. Carty*, 520 F.3d 984, 992 (9th Cir. 2008) (en banc).

Rea next argues that the sentence is substantively unreasonable. The district court did not abuse its discretion, however, in selecting the below-Guidelines sentence, which is substantively reasonable under the applicable § 3553(a) sentencing factors and the totality of the circumstances. *See Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007).

AFFIRMED.