

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-4360

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ERIC NOE ARAUJO FLORES, a/k/a Eric Orellano Arujo, a/k/a
Eric Orellana Arujo,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District
Judge. (1:15-cr-00320-LO-1)

Submitted: February 15, 2017

Decided: February 22, 2017

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph R. Conte, LAW OFFICE OF J. R. CONTE, Washington, D.C.;
Charles J. Soschin, LAW OFFICE OF C. J. SOSCHIN, Washington,
D.C., for Appellant. Dana J. Boente, United States Attorney,
Michael J. Frank, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria,
Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric Noe Araujo Flores was convicted by a jury of four counts of sex trafficking of a child, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a) (2012) (sex trafficking convictions); three counts of foreign travel with intent to engage in illicit sexual conduct, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2423(b) (2012) (foreign travel convictions); one count of coercion and enticement, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2422(b) (2012) (coercion and enticement convictions); and one count of harboring an alien for an immoral purpose, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1328 (2012), and he was sentenced to 300 months in prison. Flores asserts that the Government presented insufficient evidence to support his sex trafficking, foreign travel, and coercion and enticement convictions. Finding no error, we affirm.

We review de novo a district court's denial of a Fed. R. Crim. P. 29 motion for judgment of acquittal. United States v. Reed, 780 F.3d 260, 269 (4th Cir.), cert. denied sub nom. Cannon v. United States, 136 S. Ct. 112 (2015). A defendant challenging the sufficiency of the evidence faces "a heavy burden[.]" United States v. McLean, 715 F.3d 129, 137 (4th Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted). The jury verdict must be sustained if "there is substantial evidence in the record, when viewed in the light most favorable to the government, to support the conviction." United States v. Jaensch, 665 F.3d 83,

93 (4th Cir. 2011) (internal quotation marks omitted). "Substantial evidence is evidence that a reasonable finder of fact could accept as adequate and sufficient to support a conclusion of a defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt." Id. (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). In fact, "[r]eversal for insufficient evidence is reserved for the rare case where the prosecution's failure is clear." United States v. Ashley, 606 F.3d 135, 138 (4th Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks omitted). We have reviewed the record and conclude that, viewed in the light most favorable to the Government, there was substantial evidence to support Flores' convictions.

Based on the foregoing, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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