United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 06-3330

_____

United States of America,　　　　　*
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*
　　　　　　Appellee,　　　　　　　*　Appeal from the United States
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*　District Court for the
　　　v.　　　　　　　　　　　　　*　Northern District of Iowa.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*
Heather Servantez,　　　　　　　　*　[UNPUBLISHED]
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*
　　　　　　Appellant.　　　　　　　*

_____

Submitted: August 10, 2007
Filed: August 23, 2007

_____

Before WOLLMAN, COLLOTON, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

_____

PER CURIAM.

Heather Servantez appeals the 126-month prison terms the district court[1] imposed after she pleaded guilty to two drug offenses under 21 U.S.C. §§ 841 and 846. For reversal, she argues that her sentence is unreasonable and the district court committed a clear error of judgment by sentencing her at the top of the advisory Sentencing Guidelines range, because the court gave undue weight to her criminal history without taking into account the petty nature of most of the offenses.

---

[1]The Honorable Linda R. Reade, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa.

When the applicable Guidelines range is undisputed, as it is here, we consider whether the sentence is unreasonable in light of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors. *See United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220, 261-62 (2005). The presumption of reasonableness accorded a sentence within the Guidelines range, *see Rita v. United States*, 127 S. Ct. 2456, 2462-68 (2007), may be rebutted by showing that the district court failed to consider a factor that should have received significant weight, gave significant weight to an irrelevant factor, or otherwise committed a clear error of judgment, *see United States v. Davidson*, 437 F.3d 737, 741 (8th Cir. 2006). The record supports that the district court properly considered only relevant factors, including Servantez's extensive criminal history and her role in the conspiracy, and did not commit a clear error of judgment in choosing a sentence at the top of the Guidelines range. Thus, we conclude that the sentence is not unreasonable.

Accordingly, we affirm.

_____