

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

September 12, 2017

Elisabeth A. Shumaker  
Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTIAN HUGO CONTRERAS,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 17-2057  
(D.C. No. 5:15-CR-01415-RB-3)  
(D. N.M.)

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\***

Before **BRISCOE, LUCERO, and PHILLIPS**, Circuit Judges.

Christian Hugo Contreras accepted a plea agreement and pleaded guilty to drug and money-laundering offenses. He was sentenced to 97 months of imprisonment, which was at the low end of the sentencing guidelines range. Although the plea agreement contained an appeal waiver, Contreras appealed. The government moves to enforce the appeal waiver under *United States v. Hahn*, 359 F.3d 1315, 1328 (10th Cir. 2004) (en banc) (per curiam).

Under *Hahn*, we consider “(1) whether the disputed appeal falls within the scope of the waiver of appellate rights; (2) whether the defendant knowingly and voluntarily waived his appellate rights; and (3) whether enforcing the waiver would

---

\* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

result in a miscarriage of justice.” *Id.* at 1325. We need not address a *Hahn* factor that the appellant does not contest. *See United States v. Porter*, 405 F.3d 1136, 1143 (10th Cir. 2005).

In his response to the government’s motion, Contreras, through counsel, informs the court that he does not oppose the motion. Further, he has not contested any of the *Hahn* factors. Accordingly, the motion to enforce is granted, and this matter is terminated.

Entered for the Court  
Per Curiam