

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 22-30267  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit  
**FILED**  
November 28, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

JOHNNY LEE HENDERSON, JR.,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 5:21-CR-99-1

---

Before JONES, HAYNES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Johnny Lee Henderson, Jr., appeals the 188-month within-guidelines sentence imposed after he pleaded guilty to enticement of a minor to engage in sexual activity. He asserts that his sentence is substantively unreasonable. Specifically, he contends that his being a father, employment history, and

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 22-30267

intention to be a productive member of society should have been given more weight than his lengthy criminal history.

After *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005), we review sentences for reasonableness. *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 46 (2007). We first examine whether the district court committed any significant procedural error. *Id.* at 51. If the district court's decision is procedurally sound, we will then typically consider the substantive reasonableness of the sentence under an abuse-of-discretion standard. *Id.*; *United States v. Mondragon-Santiago*, 564 F.3d 357, 360 (5th Cir. 2009). Henderson's within-guidelines sentence is entitled to a presumption of reasonableness. *See United States v. Rashad*, 687 F.3d 637, 644 (5th Cir. 2012). Henderson's general disagreement with the propriety of his sentence and the district court's weighing of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors does not rebut that presumption. *See United States v. Rita*, 551 F.3d 338, 3602 (2007). Consequently, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.