Case: 17-50505 Document: 00514370478 Page: 1 Date Filed: 03/02/2018

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-50505 Summary Calendar United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED March 2, 2018

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

JUAN CARLOS AGUILERA-TORRES, also known as Ramirez-Huertos, also known as German Ramirez-Huertos,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas USDC No. 3:17-CR-394-1

Before BENAVIDES, CLEMENT, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

Juan Carlos Aguilera-Torres appeals the 30-month sentence imposed following his guilty plea conviction for attempted illegal reentry. He contends that the district court erred in finding that he obstructed justice and failed to accept responsibility when he gave a false name at rearraignment.

^{*} Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 17-50505

The district court did not clearly err in finding that Aguilera-Torres obstructed justice by willfully providing materially false information to the court. See United States v. Juarez-Duarte, 513 F.3d 204, 208 (5th Cir. 2008); United States v. McDonald, 964 F.2d 390, 392-93 (5th Cir. 1992); U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1 & comment. (n.4(F) & n.6). Contrary to his argument, his identity was material. See United States v. Montano-Silva, 15 F.3d 52, 53 (5th Cir. 1994). The district court's implicit finding that he willfully provided false testimony was plausible in light of the record. See Juarez-Duarte, 513 F.3d at 208. The district court's implicit findings that Aguilera-Torres's false rearraignment testimony demonstrated that he had not accepted responsibility for his offense and that his was not one of the extraordinary cases in which the reduction should apply were not without foundation. See id. at 211; U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1 & comment. (n.1(A), n.3, & n.4).

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.