United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 14-2989

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Felipe Yanez-Estrada

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Northern District of Iowa, Waterloo

Submitted: February 6, 2015
Filed: February 9, 2015
[Unpublished]

Before SMITH, GRUENDER, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Felipe Yanez-Estrada directly appeals the sentence imposed by the district court.[1] In a brief filed under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), counsel argues that Yanez's sentence was substantively unreasonable.

---

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

After careful review, this court affirms. *See United States v. Feemster*, 572 F.3d 455, 461 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (this court reviews sentence under deferential abuse-of-discretion standard). Yanez's sentence was not substantively unreasonable, as the district court identified relevant sentencing factors, did not commit a clear error of judgment in weighing the factors, and sentenced Yanez at the bottom of his correctly calculated Guidelines range. *See United States v. Salazar-Aleman*, 741 F.3d 878, 881 (8th Cir. 2013) (outlining substantive-reasonableness test); *United States v. Rubashkin*, 655 F.3d 849, 869 (8th Cir. 2011) (sentences within Guidelines range are presumed to be substantively reasonable); *Feemster*, 572 F.3d at 464 (substantive review is narrow and deferential to sentencing court).

An independent review of the record under *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), reveals no nonfrivolous issues for appeal. This court notes that any claim for a sentence reduction based on Guidelines Amendment 782, *see* U.S.S.G. Supp. App. C Amend. 782 (Nov. 1, 2014) (reducing base offense level for 10,000-30,000 kilograms of marijuana to 34), should be raised in a sentence-reduction motion filed in the district court. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (permitting sentence reduction based on retroactive Guidelines amendment).

The judgment is affirmed. Counsel's request to withdraw is granted.
