

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-10412
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 2:99-cr-00030-JES-DNF-2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

NATHANIEL WILLIS PITTS, JR.,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida

(April 3, 2015)

Before HULL, WILLIAM PRYOR and JULIE CARNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Nathaniel Willis Pitts, Jr. appeals his sentence of 24 months of imprisonment

following the second revocation of his supervised release. Pitts argues that his sentence is substantively unreasonable. We affirm.

Pitts is barred from challenging the reasonableness of his sentence. Under the doctrine of invited error, when a defendant invites or induces the district court to impose a particular sentence, the defendant cannot complain about that sentence on appeal. *United States v. Brannan*, 562 F.3d 1300, 1306 (11th Cir. 2009). After the district court revoked Pitts’s supervised release and ordered him to serve 9 months of imprisonment and 24 months of supervised release, Pitts interjected that “if [he was] going to go to prison, [he] might as well get it over with” and he wanted to “serve the 24 months straight.” When questioned by the district court, Pitts confirmed that he wanted a sentence of 24 months of imprisonment. Pitts cannot contest the substantive reasonableness of a sentence that he requested. And even if the doctrine of invited error did not apply, we would affirm Pitts’s sentence within the guideline range as substantively reasonable.

We **AFFIRM** Pitts’s sentence.