## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	·	
-	No. 19-4843	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
PEDRO VILLALONA-TORRES,	a/k/a Pretty Boy,	
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
-		
Appeal from the United States Dis Paul W. Grimm, District Judge. (8		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Submitted: November 19, 2020		Decided: November 23, 2020
Before WILKINSON, KING, and G	QUATTLEBAUM, (	Circuit Judges.
Affirmed by unpublished per curiar	m opinion.	
Justin Eisele, SEDDIQ LAW FIRM United States Attorney, Baltimore, Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNIT Appellee.	Maryland, Gregory	Bernstein, Assistant United States

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Pedro Villalona-Torres pled guilty, without a plea agreement, to conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute five kilograms or more of cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846, and possession with intent to distribute a controlled substance, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1). The district court imposed a below-Guidelines sentence of 100 months' imprisonment. Villalona-Torres appeals, arguing that his sentence is both procedurally and substantively unreasonable. Finding no error, we affirm.

We review Villalona-Torres' sentence for reasonableness, applying "a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard." *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 41 (2007). We first ensure that the court "committed no significant procedural error," such as improperly calculating the Guidelines range, failing to consider the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, or inadequately explaining the sentence. *United States v. Lynn*, 592 F.3d 572, 575 (4th Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks omitted). If we find the sentence procedurally reasonable, we also review its substantive reasonableness under "the totality of the circumstances." *Gall*, 552 U.S. at 516. We presume that a sentence within or below the Guidelines range is substantively reasonable. *United States v. Zelaya*, 908 F.3d 920, 930 (4th Cir. 2018) (citation omitted). Villalona-Torres can only rebut the presumption by showing that the sentence is unreasonable when measured against the § 3553(a) factors. *United States v. Louthian*, 756 F.3d 295, 306 (4th Cir. 2014).

Villalona-Torres first argues that the district court abused its discretion by denying him a reduction for acceptance of responsibility. <u>U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual</u>, § 3E1.1 (2015). Because the district court properly assessed a two-level enhancement for

obstruction of justice, USSG § 3C1.1, Villalona-Torres was not eligible for a reduction for acceptance of responsibility except in "extraordinary cases." USSG § 3E1.1 cmt. n. 4. We find that Villalona-Torres cannot make this showing. Next, Villalona-Torres asserts that the district court failed to consider all of his non-frivolous sentencing arguments. We have reviewed the transcript of Villalona-Torres' sentencing hearing and find that this argument is unsupported by the record. The court properly evaluated the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, considered the parties' arguments, and adequately explained its reasons for determining that a 100-month term was appropriate. We conclude that the district court met its obligation to "provide a rationale tailored to the particular case at hand and adequate to permit a meaningful appellate review," United States v. Carter, 564 F.3d 325, 330 (4th Cir. 2009). (internal quotation marks and citations omitted), and that Villalona-Torres' sentence is procedurally reasonable. Finally, we find that Villalona-Torres has failed to rebut the presumption of substantive reasonableness accorded his below-Guidelines sentence.

Therefore, we affirm Villalona-Torres' sentence. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

**AFFIRMED**