

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CARLOS ACEVEZ GUTIERREZ,  
Defendant.

Case Nos.: 14CR0447-JLS  
15CV1135-JLS

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2255 TO  
VACATE, SET ASIDE OR CORRECT  
SENTENCE and DENYING CERTIFICATE  
OF APPEALABILITY**

Presently before the Court is Defendant's Motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody (ECF No. 32). The Court has considered Defendant's motion and the record in this case and, for the reasons set forth below, will dismiss Defendant's motion.

**Background**

Defendant Gutierrez was charged with importation of methamphetamine in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 952 and 960. ECF No. 11. On May 10, 2014, Defendant pled guilty to the charge pursuant to a plea agreement. ECF No. 21. On June 27, 2014, Defendant was sentenced to a term of 37 months' imprisonment and a three-year term of

1 supervised release.<sup>1</sup> The 37-month term of imprisonment incorporated a downward  
2 variance that was the equivalent of a two-level reduction in base offense level based upon  
3 Defendant's agreement not to seek a further reduced sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §  
4 3582(c) in the event of the anticipated 2014 amendment to the United States Sentencing  
5 Guideline drug quantity table.<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 28.


### 6 **Analysis**

7 In the instant motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, Defendant contends that he is  
8 entitled to a 2-level sentence reduction in light of the 2014 amendment to the guideline  
9 drug quantity table. The record establishes, however, that Defendant's sentence did  
10 encompass a two-level variance which was the equivalent of the reduction in base offense  
11 level Defendant would have received after the effective date of the 2014 amendment to  
12 the Sentencing Guidelines. Therefore, Defendant presents no valid basis to vacate, set  
13 aside, or correct his sentence.

14 Accordingly, Defendant's Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or  
15 Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody is DENIED. Additionally, the Court  
16 DENIES Defendant a certificate of appealability, as Defendant has not made a substantial  
17 showing that he has been denied a constitutional right. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2)  
18 (providing that a certificate shall issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial  
19 showing of a denial of a constitutional right").

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: June 5, 2018

22   
23 Hon. Janis L. Sammartino  
24 United States District Judge

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>1</sup> According to the Federal Bureau of Prisons inmate locator website, Defendant was released from  
27 confinement on October 12, 2016 and he presumably remains on supervised release. Thus, as collateral  
28 consequences continue to result from the sentence imposed, the Court does not consider Defendant's  
motion to be mooted by his release from custody.

<sup>2</sup> U.S.S.G. Amendment 782 (2014).