

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-40570
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit
FILED
September 25, 2026
Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

RICARDO QUINTANILLA,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 7:19-CR-522-1

Before KING, HIGGINSON, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Ricardo Quintanilla is serving a total sentence of 200 months of imprisonment for multiple fraud and money laundering convictions. He appeals the denial of his motion for a reduction in sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) pursuant to Part B, Subpart 1, of Amendment 821. He argues that the district court failed to calculate and consider the amended guidelines range and failed to consider his arguments involving the 18 U.S.C.

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

No. 25-40570

§ 3553(a) factors, under which he asserts he made a substantial case in favor of a sentence reduction.

The district court's order stated that Quintanilla was eligible for the reduction and that it had considered the relevant information in the case, the record, the presentence report, and the Guidelines. *See Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 585 U.S. 109, 116 (2018); *United States v. Henderson*, 636 F.3d 713, 717 (5th Cir. 2011). In determining that a reduction was not warranted under the § 3553(a) factors, the district court noted specifically that a further reduction in Quintanilla's sentence would not provide just punishment for the offense or provide deterrence, that Quintanilla had been granted a variance and sentenced below the guidelines range for all but one conviction at his original sentencing, and that the changes to the Guidelines did not warrant a further change to Quintanilla's sentence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A)-(B). Quintanilla's arguments challenging the district court's weighing of the § 3553(a) factors constitute a mere disagreement with the district court's analysis. *See United States v. Evans*, 587 F.3d 667, 672-73 (5th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, Quintanilla has failed to demonstrate an abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Calton*, 900 F.3d 706, 710 (5th Cir. 2018).

AFFIRMED.