

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-3882

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Christopher Ray Jones,

Appellant.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Appeal from the United States
District Court for the
District of Nebraska.

[UNPUBLISHED]

Submitted: May 10, 2010

Filed: May 14, 2010

Before BYE, MELLOY, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

On May 21, 2009, Christopher Jones was indicted by the Grand Jury for the District of Nebraska for failure to register as a sex offender, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2250(a). A plea agreement was entered into between Jones and the United States in which the United States agreed to recommend that Jones receive a reduction in the base offense level for acceptance of responsibility and a sentence at the low-end of the applicable sentencing guideline range. Jones pleaded guilty.

The Presentence Investigation Report, not objected to by Jones, calculated the advisory guideline sentencing range at 21 to 27 months imprisonment and five years to life of supervised release. Jones filed a Motion for Variance which was denied by

the district court. On December 4, 2009, the district court¹ sentenced Jones to 21-months' imprisonment. Jones filed a timely notice of appeal, arguing the sentence imposed by the district court is unreasonable. We affirm.

We hold the district court did not abuse its discretion or impose an unreasonable sentence. See United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (indicating that appellate court reviews for abuse of discretion, first ensuring that district court committed no significant procedural error, and then considering substantive reasonableness of sentence). We find no indication that the court overlooked or misapplied any relevant section 3553(a) factor, or gave significant weight to an improper or irrelevant factor. See United States v. Stults, 575 F.3d 834, 849 (8th Cir. 2009) (indicating that sentence was not unreasonable where record reflected that district court made individualized assessment based on facts presented and specifically addressed defendant's proffered information in its consideration of sentencing factors).

We affirm.

¹The Honorable Richard J. Kopf, United States District Court for the District of Nebraska.