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UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee, v.

DANIEL ALDECOA-GONZALEZ, Defendant - Appellant.

No. 11-10376
D.C. No. 4:10-cr-02186-CKJ

## MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Arizona
Cindy K. Jorgenson, District Judge, Presiding
Submitted February 21, 2012**

Before: FERNANDEZ, McKEOWN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Daniel Aldecoa-Gonzalez appeals from the 41-month sentence imposed following his guilty-plea conviction for importation of cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 925(a), and 960(a)(1), (b)(2)(B)(ii), and possession with intent to

[^0]distribute cocaine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(B)(ii)(II). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Aldecoa-Gonzalez contends that the district court erred by declining to award a minor role adjustment because he was less culpable than the principals in the offense. The district court did not clearly err by declining to award the adjustment. See United States v. Cantrell, 433 F.3d 1269, 1283 (9th Cir.2006).

Aldecoa-Gonzalez also contends that the district court erred by not granting a third-point reduction for acceptance of responsibility. This contention lacks merit. See U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(b), cmt. n. 6; see also United States v. Johnson, 581 F.3d 994, 1004 (9th Cir. 2006).

Aldecoa-Gonzalez finally contends the district court procedurally erred by failing properly to calculate the advisory Guidelines range. This contention is belied by the record. See United States v. Carty, 520 F.3d 984, 991 (9th Cir. 2008) (en banc).

## AFFIRMED.


[^0]:    This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.
    ** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

