US v. Saul Garcia-Benitez Doc. 920091202

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7221

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SAUL GARCIA-BENITEZ, a/k/a Mario,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. Glen E. Conard, District Judge. (5:06-cr-00046-GEC-3)

Submitted: November 19, 2009 Decided: December 2, 2009

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Saul Garcia-Benitez, Appellant Pro Se. Donald Ray Wolthuis, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Saul Garcia-Benitez seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion for reduction of sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582 (2006). In criminal cases, the defendant must file the notice of appeal within ten days after the entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(1)(A); see United States v. Alvarez, 210 F.3d 309, 310 (5th Cir. 2000) (holding that § 3582 proceeding is criminal in nature and ten-day appeal period applies). With or without a motion, upon a showing of excusable neglect or good cause, the district court may grant an extension of up to thirty days to file a notice of appeal. Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(4); United States v. Reyes, 759 F.2d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 1985).

district court entered its order denying the The motion for reduction of sentence on June Garcia-Benitez filed the notice of appeal on June 24, 2009,* after the ten-day period expired but within the thirty-day excusable neglect period. Because the notice of appeal was filed within the excusable neglect period, we remand the case to the district court for the court to determine whether

^{*} For the purpose of this appeal, we assume that the date appearing on the notice of appeal is the earliest date it could have been properly delivered to prison officials for mailing to the court. Fed. R. App. P. 4(c); <u>Houston v. Lack</u>, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

Garcia-Benitez has shown excusable neglect or good cause warranting an extension of the ten-day appeal period. The record, as supplemented, will then be returned to this court for further consideration.

REMANDED