

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 07-1966

---

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Isaac Vuittonet,

Appellant.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

Appeal from the United States  
District Court for the  
District of Minnesota.  
[UNPUBLISHED]

---

Submitted: December 5, 2007  
Filed: December 12, 2007

---

Before WOLLMAN, COLLOTON, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Isaac Vuittonet appeals the 210-month prison term that the district court<sup>1</sup> imposed after he pleaded guilty to conspiring to distribute methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(b)(1)(A) and 846. He argues that his sentence is unreasonable because the district court overvalued the seriousness of his criminal history, the theoretical deterrent effect of imposing a lengthy sentence, and the generalized need to avoid sentence disparities.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Patrick J. Schiltz, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

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); United States v. Haack, 403 F.3d 997, 1003 (8th Cir. 2005). We conclude that Vuittonet's sentence at the bottom of the advisory Guidelines range is not unreasonable. The record shows that the district court considered only relevant factors--including Vuittonet's prior convictions and probationary sentences for possessing large amounts of marijuana, his commission of this even more serious offense while on probation, and the need to deter such activity--and we see no clear error of judgment in the court's weighing of those factors. See United States v. Harris, 493 F.3d 928, 932 (8th Cir. 2007) (sentence within advisory Guidelines range is presumptively reasonable); Haack, 403 F.3d at 1003-04 (describing how court may abuse its discretion in its consideration of sentencing factors); see also United States v. Rita, 127 S. Ct. 2456, 2462 (2007) (approving appellate presumption of reasonableness).

The judgment is affirmed.

---