

# United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 24-50393  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

January 15, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

RONALD ELIUD MARADIAGA-SANCHEZ,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 2:21-CR-2029-1

---

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

PER CURIAM:\*

Ronald Eliud Maradiaga-Sanchez, federal prisoner # 83823-479, appeals the district court's denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) motion to reduce his 50-month within-guidelines sentence for illegal reentry. His motion was based on Part A of Amendment 821 to the Sentencing Guidelines. Maradiaga-Sanchez argues that the district court erred in denying his motion,

---

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

No. 24-50393

contending that the district court's reasons for the denial were insufficient, the court failed to consider his arguments regarding rehabilitation, and the court erred in weighing the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors.

We review for abuse of discretion a district court's decision whether to reduce a sentence pursuant to § 3582(c)(2). *United States v. Calton*, 900 F.3d 706, 710 (5th Cir. 2018). The district court denied Maradiaga-Sanchez's motion upon finding that a sentence reduction was not warranted based on the need to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A). The district court's reasons for denying Maradiaga-Sanchez's motion were sufficient. *See United States v. Batiste*, 980 F.3d 466, 479 (5th Cir. 2020); *United States v. Evans*, 587 F.3d 667, 673–74 (5th Cir. 2009). Furthermore, even if the district court did not expressly address Maradiaga-Sanchez's rehabilitation, the issue was raised in his § 3582(c)(2) motion, and we can infer that the district court considered his rehabilitative efforts. *See Evans*, 587 F.3d at 673; *see also Concepcion v. United States*, 597 U.S. 481, 502 (2022). Maradiaga-Sanchez's remaining arguments concerning the § 3553(a) factors merely show his disagreement with how the court weighed those factors and are insufficient to show an abuse of discretion. *See Evans*, 587 F.3d at 672–73.

Based on the foregoing, Maradiaga-Sanchez has failed to demonstrate any legal error or clearly erroneous assessment of the evidence in the district court's denial of his motion. *See Batiste*, 980 F.3d at 469. Accordingly, the district court's order is AFFIRMED.