### **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRIGHT,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 15-50448

D.C. No. 3:05-cr-00200-BEN

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of California Roger T. Benitez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 14, 2016\*\*

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Christopher Wright appeals from the district court's order denying his

motion for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). We have

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for abuse of discretion, see United

States v. Dunn, 728 F.3d 1151, 1155 (9th Cir. 2013), and we affirm.

## \* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

# **FILED**

DEC 19 2016

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Wright contends that the district court abused its discretion by failing to calculate the amended Guidelines range, by failing to fully consider the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, and by declining to reduce his sentence under Amendment 782 to the Sentencing Guidelines. The record reflects that the court determined that it had discretion to reduce Wright's sentence because he was sentenced based on a Guidelines range that was subsequently lowered. The court then considered the section 3553(a) factors, and based on those factors, declined to exercise its discretion to lower Wright's sentence. While Wright contends the court failed to consider his post-sentencing rehabilitation, Wright never presented evidence of such rehabilitation to the district court. Contrary to Wright's contentions, the court satisfied its procedural obligations. See United States v. Lightfoot, 626 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2010). Moreover, in light of Wright's criminal history, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Wright's motion. See id. at 1095-96.

#### AFFIRMED.