

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-4568

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEANDRE SCOTT ESTELLE, a/k/a Dre,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Wheeling. John Preston Bailey, Chief District Judge. (5:12-cr-00020-JPB-JES-6)

Submitted: March 25, 2014

Decided: March 27, 2014

Before GREGORY, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric S. Black, Berkley Springs, West Virginia, for Appellant.
William J. Ihlenfeld, II, United States Attorney, Randolph J. Bernard, Robert H. McWilliams, Jr., Assistant United States Attorneys, Wheeling, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Deandre Scott Estelle pled guilty, pursuant to a written plea agreement, to one count of conspiracy to distribute controlled substances and was sentenced to 165 months' imprisonment. He appeals, challenging the reasonableness of his sentence.

This court reviews a sentence for reasonableness under an abuse of discretion standard. Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). This review requires consideration of both the procedural and substantive reasonableness of a sentence. Id.; see United States v. Lynn, 592 F.3d 572, 575 (4th Cir. 2010). In determining the procedural reasonableness of a sentence, we consider whether the district court properly calculated the defendant's Guidelines range, treated the Guidelines as advisory, considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2012) factors, analyzed any arguments presented by the parties, and sufficiently explained the selected sentence. Gall, 552 U.S. at 51. A sentence imposed within the properly calculated Guidelines range is presumed reasonable by this court. See Rita v. United States, 551 U.S. 338, 347 (2007); United States v. Mendoza-Mendoza, 597 F.3d 212, 217 (4th Cir. 2010).

We have reviewed the record and the briefs filed by the parties and find that Estelle's sentence is both procedurally and substantively reasonable. Therefore we affirm.

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 in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED