## **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

SAN JUAN HERNANDEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 16-10003

D.C. No. 4:07-cr-01581-RCC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Arizona Raner C. Collins, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 16, 2016\*\*

Before: LEAVY, BERZON, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

San Juan Hernandez 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, and we vacate and remand.

Hernandez contends that the district court failed to explain adequately its

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

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

## **FILED**

NOV 21 2016

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS denial of his motion for a sentence reduction under Amendment 782 to the Sentencing Guidelines. We agree. The district court's order does not address or explain its rejection of the arguments presented in either Hernandez's motion for a sentence reduction or probation's recommendation that the district court grant a sentence reduction. Accordingly, we vacate and remand. *See United States v. Trujillo*, 713 F.3d 1003, 1009-10 (9th Cir. 2013) (district court must provide some explanation for rejecting a defendant's non-frivolous arguments).

## VACATED and REMANDED.