

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-10099
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

December 4, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

MARIO PEREZ,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:15-CR-271-11

Before GRAVES, WILLETT, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Mario Perez, federal prisoner #50701-177, appeals the denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion to reduce his sentence. Perez argues, among other things, that the district court failed to consider properly the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors or to articulate sufficiently its analysis of those

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 24-10099

factors. We review the denial for an abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020).

The district court expressly stated that it had reviewed the § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion, the record, and all the § 3553(a) factors. The court concluded that, since Perez had served less than half of his sentence for his participation in a dangerous drug-trafficking conspiracy, a reduction of his sentence would not reflect the seriousness of his conduct, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment, or afford adequate deterrence to his criminal conduct. *See* 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(A)-(B). The district court was not required to offer further explanation for its decision. *See Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 585 U.S. 109, 116 (2018).

Perez's mere disagreement with the district court's assessment of the § 3553(a) factors provides no basis for holding that the court abused its discretion. *See Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 694. Because the § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) denial is independently supported by the district court's § 3553(a) analysis, we need not consider Perez's contentions that he identified extraordinary and compelling reasons and that he does not constitute a danger to the safety of others and the community. *See United States v. Rollins*, 53 F.4th 353, 358 (5th Cir. 2022).

The decision of the district court is AFFIRMED.