

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 11-2852

---

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Carla Marshall,

Appellant.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\* Appeal from the United States  
\* District Court for the  
\* Northern District of Iowa.  
\*  
\* [UNPUBLISHED]  
\*

---

Submitted: December 6, 2011  
Filed: December 15, 2011

---

Before MELLOY, BOWMAN, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Carla Marshall appeals the sentence the district court<sup>1</sup> imposed upon revoking her supervised release. Upon careful review, we conclude that it was not unreasonable for the district court to sentence Marshall to a 4-month prison term, which was within the advisory Guidelines range and below the statutory maximum, followed by a 1-year supervised-release term, which was also authorized by statute. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3) (maximum term of imprisonment upon revocation of supervised release is 2 years for Class C felony); 18 U.S.C. § 3583(h) (maximum term

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Linda R. Reade, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa.

of supervised release upon revocation of supervised release is term of supervised release authorized by statute for offense that resulted in original term of supervised release, less any term of imprisonment imposed upon revocation); 21 U.S.C. § 841(b)(1)(C) (requiring at least 3 years of supervised release, but not setting forth maximum term of supervised release); United States v. Petreikis, 551 F.3d 822, 824 (8th Cir. 2009) (applying presumption of substantive reasonableness to revocation sentence within Guidelines range); United States v. Perkins, 526 F.3d 1107, 1110 (8th Cir. 2008) (district court need not make specific findings on 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors; all that is generally required to satisfy appellate court is evidence that court was aware of relevant factors); see also United States v. Tyson, 413 F.3d 824, 825 (8th Cir. 2005) (per curiam) (revocation sentences reviewed for unreasonableness in accordance with United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)).

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We also grant counsel's motion to withdraw.

---