

APPENDIX A

FILED

MAY 23 2025

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

MARTIN GUTIERREZ-BARBA,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 21-10232

D.C. Nos.

2:19-cr-01224-DJH-1

2:19-cr-01224-DJH

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona

Diane J. Humetewa, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 12, 2025**
Phoenix, Arizona

Before: RAWLINSON, BUMATAY, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Martin Gutierrez-Barba (Gutierrez-Barba) appeals his conviction and sentence for reentry of a removed alien in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a). He also appeals the denial of his request to present a necessity defense. Reviewing de

* 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).

novo, we affirm. *See United States v. Raygosa-Esparza*, 566 F.3d 852, 854 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also United States v. Hammons*, 558 F.3d 1100, 1103 (9th Cir. 2009).¹

1. To present evidence of necessity as a defense, a defendant must first establish through an offer of proof that: “(1) he was faced with a choice of evils and chose the lesser evil; (2) he acted to prevent imminent harm; (3) he reasonably anticipated a causal relation between his conduct and the harm to be avoided; *and* (4) there were no other legal alternatives to violating the law.” *United States v. Barnes*, 895 F.3d 1194, 1204 (9th Cir. 2018) (citation, footnote reference, and internal quotation marks omitted) (emphasis added). Gutierrez-Barba’s offer of proof failed to meet this standard. At a minimum, Gutierrez-Barba failed to establish that he acted to prevent imminent harm.

“[T]he test for entitlement to a defense of necessity is objective.” *United States v. Perdomo-Espana*, 522 F.3d 983, 988 (9th Cir. 2008). Viewing Gutierrez-Barba’s claim of necessity objectively, we are not persuaded that Gutierrez-Barba’s presence was necessary to prevent imminent harm to his young daughter. As

¹The parties disagree as to whether some claims should be reviewed for plain error rather than de novo. Because we conclude that Gutierrez-Barba’s claims fail under either standard of review, we need not address this issue.

evidenced in his motion in limine, Gutierrez-Barba's young daughter was provided excellent medical care, including "the most advanced technology afforded by the United States medical system." Viewed objectively, Gutierrez-Barba's presence was not necessary to provide for his young daughter's medical needs. *See id.*

2. To succeed on a claim that the district court violated the Due Process Clause by imposing "a sentence founded at least in part upon misinformation of constitutional magnitude," Gutierrez-Barba "must establish the challenged information is (1) false or unreliable, and (2) demonstrably made the basis for the sentence." *United States v. Hill*, 915 F.3d 669, 674 (9th Cir. 2019) (citations omitted). The district court's reference to a "plan" to return was made in the context of Gutierrez-Barba's repeated illegal entries and the need to decide how to maintain his family relationships post-removal. Because that context was not predicated on any false or unreliable information, Gutierrez-Barba's due process challenge fails. *See United States v. Rivera*, 682 F.3d 1223, 1237 n.12 (9th Cir. 2012).

3. The district court adequately responded to Gutierrez-Barba's mitigation argument that because the government had indicated that it was likely he would be removed from the United States, there was need to impose a sentence to deter him from future crime. The government clarified during sentencing that it was not a

question of “whether Mr. Gutierrez-Barba is going to be removed. It’s when. Therefore, it was not necessary for the district court to further elaborate on the deterrence factor. *See United States v. Petri*, 731 F.3d 833, 842 (9th Cir. 2013).

AFFIRMED.²

² Gutierrez-Barba’s unopposed Third Motion to Extend Reply Brief Deadline (Dkt. 68) is **GRANTED**. We have considered the Reply Brief in reaching our decision.

APPENDIX B

Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1990 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 101-647 effective 180 days after Nov. 29, 1990, see section 3631 of Pub. L. 101-647, set out as an Effective Date note under section 3001 of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1986 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 99-646, §7(b), Nov. 10, 1986, 100 Stat. 3593, provided that: “The amendments made by this section [amending this section] shall take effect on the date of the taking effect of section 3552 of title 18, United States Code [Nov. 1, 1987].”

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section effective Nov. 1, 1987, and applicable only to offenses committed after the taking effect of this section, see section 235(a)(1) of Pub. L. 98-473, set out as a note under section 3551 of this title.

USE OF CERTAIN TECHNOLOGY TO FACILITATE CRIMINAL CONDUCT

Pub. L. 104-294, title V, §501, Oct. 11, 1996, 110 Stat. 3497, provided that:

“(a) INFORMATION.—The Administrative Office of the United States courts shall establish policies and procedures for the inclusion in all presentence reports of information that specifically identifies and describes any use of encryption or scrambling technology that would be relevant to an enhancement under section 3C1.1 (dealing with Obstructing or Impeding the Administration of Justice) of the Sentencing Guidelines or to offense conduct under the Sentencing Guidelines.

“(b) COMPILING AND REPORT.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall—

“(1) compile and analyze any information contained in documentation described in subsection (a) relating to the use of encryption or scrambling technology to facilitate or conceal criminal conduct; and

“(2) based on the information compiled and analyzed under paragraph (1), annually report to the Congress on the nature and extent of the use of encryption or scrambling technology to facilitate or conceal criminal conduct.”

§ 3553. Imposition of a sentence

(a) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN IMPOSING A SENTENCE.—The court shall impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The court, in determining the particular sentence to be imposed, shall consider—

(1) the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant;

(2) the need for the sentence imposed—

(A) to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense;

(B) to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct;

(C) to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and

(D) to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner;

(3) the kinds of sentences available;

(4) the kinds of sentence and the sentencing range established for—

(A) the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines—

(i) issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, subject to any amendments made to such guidelines by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28); and

(ii) that, except as provided in section 3742(g), are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; or

(B) in the case of a violation of probation or supervised release, the applicable guidelines or policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(3) of title 28, United States Code, taking into account any amendments made to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28);

(5) any pertinent policy statement—

(A) issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, subject to any amendments made to such policy statement by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28); and

(B) that, except as provided in section 3742(g), is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced.¹

(6) the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; and

(7) the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

(b) APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES IN IMPOSING A SENTENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the court shall impose a sentence of the kind, and within the range, referred to in subsection (a)(4) unless the court finds that there exists an aggravating or mitigating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence different from that described. In determining whether a circumstance was adequately taken into consideration, the court shall consider only the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary of the Sentencing Commission. In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline, the court shall impose an appropriate sentence, having due regard for the purposes set forth in subsection (a)(2). In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline in the case of an offense other than a petty offense, the court shall also have due regard for the relationship of the sentence imposed to sentences prescribed by guidelines ap-

¹ So in original. The period probably should be a semicolon.

plicable to similar offenses and offenders, and to the applicable policy statements of the Sentencing Commission.

(2) CHILD CRIMES AND SEXUAL OFFENSES.—

(A)² SENTENCING.—In sentencing a defendant convicted of an offense under section 1201 involving a minor victim, an offense under section 1591, or an offense under chapter 71, 109A, 110, or 117, the court shall impose a sentence of the kind, and within the range, referred to in subsection (a)(4) unless—

(i) the court finds that there exists an aggravating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence greater than that described;

(ii) the court finds that there exists a mitigating circumstance of a kind or to a degree, that—

(I) has been affirmatively and specifically identified as a permissible ground of downward departure in the sentencing guidelines or policy statements issued under section 994(a) of title 28, taking account of any amendments to such sentencing guidelines or policy statements by Congress;

(II) has not been taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines; and

(III) should result in a sentence different from that described; or

(iii) the court finds, on motion of the Government, that the defendant has provided substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense and that this assistance established a mitigating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence lower than that described.

In determining whether a circumstance was adequately taken into consideration, the court shall consider only the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary of the Sentencing Commission, together with any amendments thereto by act of Congress. In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline, the court shall impose an appropriate sentence, having due regard for the purposes set forth in subsection (a)(2). In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline in the case of an offense other than a petty offense, the court shall also have due regard for the relationship of the sentence imposed to sentences prescribed by guidelines applicable to similar offenses and offenders, and to the applicable policy statements of the Sentencing Commission, together with any amendments to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress.

(c) STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR IMPOSING A SENTENCE.—The court, at the time of sentencing, shall state in open court the reasons for

its imposition of the particular sentence, and, if the sentence—

(1) is of the kind, and within the range, described in subsection (a)(4), and that range exceeds 24 months, the reason for imposing a sentence at a particular point within the range; or

(2) is not of the kind, or is outside the range, described in subsection (a)(4), the specific reason for the imposition of a sentence different from that described, which reasons must also be stated with specificity in a statement of reasons form issued under section 994(w)(1)(B) of title 28, except to the extent that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32. In the event that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32 the court shall state that such statements were so received and that it relied upon the content of such statements.

If the court does not order restitution, or orders only partial restitution, the court shall include in the statement the reason therefor. The court shall provide a transcription or other appropriate public record of the court's statement of reasons, together with the order of judgment and commitment, to the Probation System and to the Sentencing Commission,³ and, if the sentence includes a term of imprisonment, to the Bureau of Prisons.

(d) PRESENTENCE PROCEDURE FOR AN ORDER OF NOTICE.—Prior to imposing an order of notice pursuant to section 3555, the court shall give notice to the defendant and the Government that it is considering imposing such an order. Upon motion of the defendant or the Government, or on its own motion, the court shall—

(1) permit the defendant and the Government to submit affidavits and written memoranda addressing matters relevant to the imposition of such an order;

(2) afford counsel an opportunity in open court to address orally the appropriateness of the imposition of such an order; and

(3) include in its statement of reasons pursuant to subsection (c) specific reasons underlying its determinations regarding the nature of such an order.

Upon motion of the defendant or the Government, or on its own motion, the court may in its discretion employ any additional procedures that it concludes will not unduly complicate or prolong the sentencing process.

(e) LIMITED AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE A SENTENCE BELOW A STATUTORY MINIMUM.—Upon motion of the Government, the court shall have the authority to impose a sentence below a level established by statute as a minimum sentence so as to reflect a defendant's substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense. Such sentence shall be imposed in accordance with the guidelines and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994 of title 28, United States Code.

(f) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY OF STATUTORY MINIMUMS IN CERTAIN CASES.—Notwithstanding

² So in original. No subpar. (B) has been enacted.

³ So in original.

any other provision of law, in the case of an offense under section 401, 404, or 406 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841, 844, 846), section 1010 or 1013 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960, 963), or section 70503 or 70506 of title 46, the court shall impose a sentence pursuant to guidelines promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission under section 994 of title 28 without regard to any statutory minimum sentence, if the court finds at sentencing, after the Government has been afforded the opportunity to make a recommendation, that—

(1) the defendant does not have—

(A) more than 4 criminal history points, excluding any criminal history points resulting from a 1-point offense, as determined under the sentencing guidelines;

(B) a prior 3-point offense, as determined under the sentencing guidelines; and

(C) a prior 2-point violent offense, as determined under the sentencing guidelines;

(2) the defendant did not use violence or credible threats of violence or possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon (or induce another participant to do so) in connection with the offense;

(3) the offense did not result in death or serious bodily injury to any person;

(4) the defendant was not an organizer, leader, manager, or supervisor of others in the offense, as determined under the sentencing guidelines and was not engaged in a continuing criminal enterprise, as defined in section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act; and

(5) not later than the time of the sentencing hearing, the defendant has truthfully provided to the Government all information and evidence the defendant has concerning the offense or offenses that were part of the same course of conduct or of a common scheme or plan, but the fact that the defendant has no relevant or useful other information to provide or that the Government is already aware of the information shall not preclude a determination by the court that the defendant has complied with this requirement.

Information disclosed by a defendant under this subsection may not be used to enhance the sentence of the defendant unless the information relates to a violent offense.

(g) **DEFINITION OF VIOLENT OFFENSE.**—As used in this section, the term “violent offense” means a crime of violence, as defined in section 16, that is punishable by imprisonment.

(Added Pub. L. 98–473, title II, §212(a)(2), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 1989; amended Pub. L. 99–570, title I, §1007(a), Oct. 27, 1986, 100 Stat. 3207–7; Pub. L. 99–646, §§8(a), 9(a), 80(a), 81(a), Nov. 10, 1986, 100 Stat. 3593, 3619; Pub. L. 100–182, §§3, 16(a), 17, Dec. 7, 1987, 101 Stat. 1266, 1269, 1270; Pub. L. 100–690, title VII, §7102, Nov. 18, 1988, 102 Stat. 4416; Pub. L. 103–322, title VIII, §80001(a), title XXVIII, §280001, Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 1985, 2095; Pub. L. 104–294, title VI, §§601(b)(5), (6), (h), Oct. 11, 1996, 110 Stat. 3499, 3500; Pub. L. 107–273, div. B, title IV, §4002(a)(8), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1807; Pub. L. 108–21, title IV, §401(a), (c), (j)(5), Apr. 30, 2003, 117 Stat. 667, 669, 673; Pub. L. 111–174, §4, May 27, 2010, 124 Stat. 1216; Pub. L.

115–391, title IV, §402(a), Dec. 21, 2018, 132 Stat. 5221.)

Editorial Notes

REFERENCES IN TEXT

The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, referred to in subsec. (c)(2), are set out in the Appendix to this title.

Section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act, referred to in subsec. (f)(4), is classified to section 848 of Title 21, Food and Drugs.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

For information regarding the constitutionality of certain provisions of this section, as amended by section 401(a)(1) of Pub. L. 108–21, see the Table of Laws Held Unconstitutional in Whole or in Part by the Supreme Court on the Constitution Annotated website, constitution.congress.gov.

AMENDMENTS

2018—Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 115–391, §402(a)(1)(A), (C), in introductory provisions, substituted “, section 1010” for “or section 1010” and inserted “, or section 70503 or 70506 of title 46” after “963”, and inserted concluding provisions.

Subsec. (f)(1). Pub. L. 115–391, §402(a)(1)(B), added par. (1) and struck out former par. (1) which read as follows: “the defendant does not have more than 1 criminal history point, as determined under the sentencing guidelines;”.

Subsec. (g). Pub. L. 115–391, §402(a)(2), added subsec. (g).

2010—Subsec. (c)(2). Pub. L. 111–174 substituted “a statement of reasons form issued under section 994(w)(1)(B) of title 28” for “the written order of judgment and commitment”.

2003—Subsec. (a)(4)(A). Pub. L. 108–21, §401(j)(5)(A), amended subpar. (A) generally. Prior to amendment, subpar. (A) read as follows: “the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, and that are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; or”.

Subsec. (a)(4)(B). Pub. L. 108–21, §401(j)(5)(B), inserted before semicolon at end “, taking into account any amendments made to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28)”.

Subsec. (a)(5). Pub. L. 108–21, §401(j)(5)(C), amended par. (5) generally. Prior to amendment, par. (5) read as follows: “any pertinent policy statement issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(a)(2) that is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced;”.

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 108–21, §401(a), designated existing provisions as par. (1), inserted par. heading, substituted “Except as provided in paragraph (2), the court” for “The court”, and added par. (2) and concluding provisions.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 108–21, §401(c)(2), (3), in concluding provisions, inserted “, together with the order of judgment and commitment,” after “the court’s statement of reasons” and “and to the Sentencing Commission,” after “to the Probation System”.

Subsec. (c)(2). Pub. L. 108–21, §401(c)(1), substituted “described, which reasons must also be stated with specificity in the written order of judgment and commitment, except to the extent that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32. In the event that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32 the court shall state that such statements were so received and that it relied upon the content of such statements” for “described”.

NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES—1974
AMENDMENT

The amendment designates the first paragraph of Rule 50 as subdivision (a) entitled “Calendars,” in view of the recent addition of subdivision (b) to the rule.

NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES—1976
AMENDMENT

This amendment to rule 50(b) takes account of the enactment of The Speedy Trial Act of 1974, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3152–3156, 3161–3174. As the various provisions of the Act take effect, see 18 U.S.C. § 3163, they and the district plans adopted pursuant thereto will supplant the plans heretofore adopted under rule 50(b). The first such plan must be prepared and submitted by each district court before July 1, 1976. 18 U.S.C. § 3165(e)(1).

That part of rule 50(b) which sets out the necessary contents of district plans has been deleted, as the somewhat different contents of the plans required by the Act are enumerated in 18 U.S.C. § 3166. That part of rule 50(b) which describes the manner in which district plans are to be submitted, reviewed, modified and reported upon has also been deleted, for these provisions now appear in 18 U.S.C. § 3165(c) and (d).

NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES—1993
AMENDMENT

The Rule is amended to conform to the Judicial Improvements Act of 1990 [P.L. 101–650, Title III, Section 321] which provides that each United States magistrate appointed under section 631 of title 28, United States Code, shall be known as a United States magistrate judge.

COMMITTEE NOTES ON RULES—2002 AMENDMENT

The language of Rule 50 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

The first sentence in current Rule 50(a), which says that a court may place criminal proceedings on a calendar, has been deleted. The Committee believed that the sentence simply stated a truism and was no longer necessary.

Current Rule 50(b), which simply mirrors 18 U.S.C. § 3165, has been deleted in its entirety. The rule was added in 1971 to meet congressional concerns in pending legislation about deadlines in criminal cases. Provisions governing deadlines were later enacted by Congress and protections were provided in the Speedy Trial Act. The Committee concluded that in light of those enactments, Rule 50(b) was no longer necessary.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1976 AMENDMENT

Amendment of subd. (b) by the order of the United States Supreme Court of Apr. 26, 1976, effective Aug. 1, 1976, see section 1 of Pub. L. 94–349, July 8, 1976, 90 Stat. 822, set out as a note under section 2074 of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

Rule 51. Preserving Claimed Error

(a) EXCEPTIONS UNNECESSARY. Exceptions to rulings or orders of the court are unnecessary.

(b) PRESERVING A CLAIM OF ERROR. A party may preserve a claim of error by informing the court—when the court ruling or order is made or sought—of the action the party wishes the court to take, or the party’s objection to the court’s action and the grounds for that objection. If a party does not have an opportunity to object to a ruling or order, the absence of an objection does not later prejudice that party. A ruling or order that admits or excludes evidence is governed by Federal Rule of Evidence 103.

(As amended Mar. 9, 1987, eff. Aug. 1, 1987; Apr. 29, 2002, eff. Dec. 1, 2002.)

NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES—1944

1. This rule is practically identical with Rule 46 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure [28 U.S.C., Appendix]. It relates to a matter of trial practice which should be the same in civil and criminal cases in the interest of avoiding confusion. The corresponding civil rule has been construed in *Ulm v. Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.*, 115 F.2d 492 (C.C.A. 2d), and *Bucy v. Nevada Construction Company*, 125 F.2d 213, 218 (C.C.A. 9th). See, also, Orfield, 22 Texas L.R. 194, 221. As to the method of taking objections to instructions to the jury, see Rule 30.

2. Many States have abolished the use of exceptions in criminal and civil cases. See, e.g., Cal.Pen. Code (Deering, 1941), sec. 1259; Mich.Stat.Ann. (Henderson, 1938), secs. 28.1046, 28.1053; Ohio Gen Code Ann. (Page, 1938), secs. 11560, 13442–7; Oreg.Comp. Laws Ann. (1940), secs. 5–704, 26–1001.

NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES—1987
AMENDMENT

The amendments are technical. No substantive change is intended.

COMMITTEE NOTES ON RULES—2002 AMENDMENT

The language of Rule 51 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

The Rule includes a new sentence that explicitly states that any rulings regarding evidence are governed by Federal Rule of Evidence 103. The sentence was added because of concerns about the Supersession Clause, 28 U.S.C. § 2072(b), of the Rules Enabling Act, and the possibility that an argument might have been made that Congressional approval of this rule would supersede that Rule of Evidence.

REFERENCES IN TEXT

The Federal Rules of Evidence, referred to in subd. (b), are set out in the Appendix to Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

Rule 52. Harmless and Plain Error

(a) HARMLESS ERROR. Any error, defect, irregularity, or variance that does not affect substantial rights must be disregarded.

(b) PLAIN ERROR. A plain error that affects substantial rights may be considered even though it was not brought to the court’s attention.

(As amended Apr. 29, 2002, eff. Dec. 1, 2002.)

NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES—1944

Note to Subdivision (a). This rule is a restatement of existing law, 28 U.S.C. [former] 391 (second sentence): “On the hearing of any appeal, certiorari, writ of error, or motion for a new trial, in any case, civil or criminal, the court shall give judgment after an examination of the entire record before the court, without regard to technical errors, defects, or exceptions which do not affect the substantial rights of the parties”; 18 U.S.C. [former] 556; “No indictment found and presented by a grand jury in any district or other court of the United States shall be deemed insufficient, nor shall the trial, judgment, or other proceeding thereon be affected by reason of any defect or imperfection in matter of form only, which shall not tend to the prejudice of the defendant, * * *.” A similar provision is found in Rule 61 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure [28 U.S.C., Appendix].

Note to Subdivision (b). This rule is a restatement of existing law, *Wiborg v. United States*, 163 U.S. 632, 658;