

**APPENDIX A:
MEMORANDUM**

734 Fed.Appx. 515 (Mem)

This case was not selected for publication in West's Federal Reporter. See Fed. Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 generally governing citation of judicial decisions issued on or after Jan. 1, 2007. See also U.S.Ct. of App. 9th Cir. Rule 36-3. United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit.

UNITED STATES of America, Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
Cliserio BALMES-CRUZ, Defendant-Appellant.

No. 17-50027

|
Argued and Submitted March
9, 2018 Pasadena, California

|
Filed August 15, 2018

Attorneys and Law Firms

Benjamin Holley, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Charlotte E. Kaiser, Helen H. Hong, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Office of the US Attorney, San Diego, CA, for Plaintiff-Appellee

Marisa Conroy, Law Office of Marisa L. D. Conroy, Encinitas, CA, for Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Larry A. Burns, District Judge, Presiding, D.C. No. 3:16-cr-02283-LAB-1

Before: TASHIMA and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges, and SIMON, * District Judge.

MEMORANDUM **

Cliserio Balmes-Cruz (“Balmes-Cruz”) appeals his sentence for illegal reentry of a removed alien, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Balmes-Cruz pleaded guilty under a “fast track” plea agreement. At sentencing, both Balmes-Cruz and the Government recommended a four-level departure under the United States Sentencing Guidelines *516 (“Guidelines”) and a sentence of four months in custody, or time served. The district court denied the four-level fast track departure and granted only a two-level departure, sentencing Balmes-Cruz to 12 months in

custody. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291 and 18 U.S.C. § 3742, and we affirm.

At sentencing, the district court stated that it was granting only a two-level departure based in part on the court’s belief that Balmes-Cruz previously had been “deported” 12 times and had a “prior immigration felony.” Balmes-Cruz argues that the district court erroneously concluded that he had been *deported* 12 times, when in fact he had been “voluntarily removed” 11 times and deported only once. Balmes-Cruz also argues that the district court erroneously believed that he previously had been convicted in 2007 of the *same crime* for which he was then being sentenced, when in fact his 2007 felony conviction was for aiding and abetting the transportation of an illegal alien in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324 and 18 U.S.C. § 2.

The district court explained that Balmes-Cruz was “entitled to something in light of the fact that it has been eight years” since his deportation in 2008, but a four-level proposed reduction was inappropriate in light of his “history of deportations and a prior immigration felony.” The district court noted that accepting the parties’ recommendation would result in a Guidelines range that was lower than the 15-month sentence that Balmes-Cruz received for his “last immigration felony,” a result that the district court expressed would “incentivize[] people to return to the United States.”

According to Balmes-Cruz, the district court relied on clearly erroneous facts. Because he did not raise these objections before the district court at the time of sentencing, we review the district court’s calculation of his sentence for plain error. *United States v. Lloyd*, 807 F.3d 1128, 1139 (9th Cir. 2015). The district court did not plainly err.

Although Balmes-Cruz argues that voluntary removals are voluntary and less expensive to the Government than deportation, in each prior case Balmes-Cruz was found to be present in the United States illegally. At sentencing, the district court incorrectly referenced Balmes-Cruz’s 12 prior “deportations,” rather than his 11 prior voluntary removals and one prior deportation, but defense counsel and the Government made the same mistake. This distinction is not material. The district court expressed concern over Balmes-Cruz’s recidivist tendencies illegally to return to the United States. This concern is not lessened by the fact that a voluntary departure is less expensive

to the Government than a deportation. Further, Balmes-Cruz did have a prior immigration-related felony. Thus, the district court did not base Balmes-Cruz's sentence on clearly erroneous facts.

Balmes-Cruz also argues that the district court applied the wrong legal standard when it denied the parties' joint recommendation for a four-level fast track departure. As a general proposition, in analyzing challenges to a district court's upward or downward departures under the Guidelines, we do not evaluate such departures for procedural correctness, but rather, as part of a sentence's substantive reasonableness. *See United States v. Ellis*, 641 F.3d 411, 421 (9th Cir. 2011). The substantive

reasonableness of a sentence is reviewed for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Crowe*, 563 F.3d 969, 977 (9th Cir. 2009). We will reverse a sentencing decision only if we have "a definite and firm conviction that the district court committed a clear error of judgment." *517 *United States v. Ressam*, 679 F.3d 1069, 1086 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc). We do not have such a conviction in this case.¹

AFFIRMED.

All Citations

734 Fed.Appx. 515 (Mem)

Footnotes

* The Honorable Michael H. Simon, United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, sitting by designation.

** This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

1 During oral argument and in post-argument correspondence, Balmes-Cruz contends that the district court manipulated the Guidelines calculation to achieve a particular Guidelines range. In *United States v. Rosales-Gonzales*, 801 F.3d 1177 (9th Cir. 2015), which involved the same sentencing judge who sentenced Balmes-Cruz, we noted that although a "district court may impose a sentence outside the Guidelines range, it may not manipulate the calculations under the Sentencing Guidelines in order to produce a Guidelines range that will allow it to impose the sentence it prefers." *Id.* at 1181 (internal quotation marks omitted). Because Balmes-Cruz did not raise this issue in his opening brief, we decline to consider it. *See Orr v. Plumb*, 884 F.3d 923, 932 (9th Cir. 2018) ("The usual rule is that arguments raised for the first time on appeal or omitted from the opening brief are deemed forfeited.").

APPENDIX B:
18 U.S.C. § 3553

United States Code Annotated
Title 18. Crimes and Criminal Procedure (Refs & Annos)
Part II. Criminal Procedure
Chapter 227. Sentences (Refs & Annos)
Subchapter A. General Provisions (Refs & Annos)

18 U.S.C.A. § 3553

§ 3553. Imposition of a sentence

Effective: May 27, 2010

Currentness

(a) Factors to be considered in imposing a sentence.--The court shall impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The court, in determining the particular sentence to be imposed, shall consider--

(1) the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant;

(2) the need for the sentence imposed--

(A) to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense;

(B) to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct;

(C) to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and

(D) to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner;

(3) the kinds of sentences available;

(4) the kinds of sentence and the sentencing range established for--

(A) the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines--

(i) issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, subject to any amendments made to such guidelines by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28); and

(ii) that, except as provided in section 3742(g), are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; or

(B) in the case of a violation of probation or supervised release, the applicable guidelines or policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(3) of title 28, United States Code, taking into account any amendments made to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28);

(5) any pertinent policy statement--

(A) issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, subject to any amendments made to such policy statement by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under section 994(p) of title 28); and

(B) that, except as provided in section 3742(g), is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced.¹

(6) the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; and

(7) the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

(b) Application of guidelines in imposing a sentence.--

(1) In general.--Except as provided in paragraph (2), the court shall impose a sentence of the kind, and within the range, referred to in subsection (a)(4) unless the court finds that there exists an aggravating or mitigating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence different from that described. In determining whether a circumstance was adequately taken into consideration, the court shall consider only the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary of the Sentencing Commission. In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline, the court shall impose an appropriate sentence, having due regard for the purposes set forth in subsection (a)(2). In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline in the case of an offense other than a petty offense, the court shall also have due regard for the relationship of the sentence imposed to sentences prescribed by guidelines applicable to similar offenses and offenders, and to the applicable policy statements of the Sentencing Commission.

(2) Child crimes and sexual offenses.--

(A) ² **Sentencing.--**In sentencing a defendant convicted of an offense under section 1201 involving a minor victim, an offense under section 1591, or an offense under chapter 71, 109A, 110, or 117, the court shall impose a sentence of the kind, and within the range, referred to in subsection (a)(4) unless--

(i) the court finds that there exists an aggravating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence greater than that described;

(ii) the court finds that there exists a mitigating circumstance of a kind or to a degree, that--

(I) has been affirmatively and specifically identified as a permissible ground of downward departure in the sentencing guidelines or policy statements issued under section 994(a) of title 28, taking account of any amendments to such sentencing guidelines or policy statements by Congress;

(II) has not been taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines; and

(III) should result in a sentence different from that described; or

(iii) the court finds, on motion of the Government, that the defendant has provided substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense and that this assistance established a mitigating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence lower than that described.

In determining whether a circumstance was adequately taken into consideration, the court shall consider only the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary of the Sentencing Commission, together with any amendments thereto by act of Congress. In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline, the court shall impose an appropriate sentence, having due regard for the purposes set forth in subsection (a)(2). In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline in the case of an offense other than a petty offense, the court shall also have due regard for the relationship of the sentence imposed to sentences prescribed by guidelines applicable to similar offenses and offenders, and to the applicable policy statements of the Sentencing Commission, together with any amendments to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress.

(c) Statement of reasons for imposing a sentence.--The court, at the time of sentencing, shall state in open court the reasons for its imposition of the particular sentence, and, if the sentence--

(1) is of the kind, and within the range, described in subsection (a)(4) and that range exceeds 24 months, the reason for imposing a sentence at a particular point within the range; or

(2) is not of the kind, or is outside the range, described in subsection (a)(4), the specific reason for the imposition of a sentence different from that described, which reasons must also be stated with specificity in a statement of reasons form issued under section 994(w)(1)(B) of title 28, except to the extent that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32. In the event that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32 the court shall state that such statements were so received and that it relied upon the content of such statements.

If the court does not order restitution, or orders only partial restitution, the court shall include in the statement the reason therefor. The court shall provide a transcription or other appropriate public record of the court's statement of reasons,

together with the order of judgment and commitment, to the Probation System and to the Sentencing Commission,,³ and, if the sentence includes a term of imprisonment, to the Bureau of Prisons.

(d) Presentence procedure for an order of notice.--Prior to imposing an order of notice pursuant to section 3555, the court shall give notice to the defendant and the Government that it is considering imposing such an order. Upon motion of the defendant or the Government, or on its own motion, the court shall--

- (1) permit the defendant and the Government to submit affidavits and written memoranda addressing matters relevant to the imposition of such an order;
- (2) afford counsel an opportunity in open court to address orally the appropriateness of the imposition of such an order; and
- (3) include in its statement of reasons pursuant to subsection (c) specific reasons underlying its determinations regarding the nature of such an order.

Upon motion of the defendant or the Government, or on its own motion, the court may in its discretion employ any additional procedures that it concludes will not unduly complicate or prolong the sentencing process.

(e) Limited authority to impose a sentence below a statutory minimum.--Upon motion of the Government, the court shall have the authority to impose a sentence below a level established by statute as a minimum sentence so as to reflect a defendant's substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense. Such sentence shall be imposed in accordance with the guidelines and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994 of title 28, United States Code.

(f) Limitation on applicability of statutory minimums in certain cases.--Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of an offense under section 401, 404, or 406 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841, 844, 846) or section 1010 or 1013 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960, 963), the court shall impose a sentence pursuant to guidelines promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission under section 994 of title 28 without regard to any statutory minimum sentence, if the court finds at sentencing, after the Government has been afforded the opportunity to make a recommendation, that--

- (1) the defendant does not have more than 1 criminal history point, as determined under the sentencing guidelines;
- (2) the defendant did not use violence or credible threats of violence or possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon (or induce another participant to do so) in connection with the offense;
- (3) the offense did not result in death or serious bodily injury to any person;
- (4) the defendant was not an organizer, leader, manager, or supervisor of others in the offense, as determined under the sentencing guidelines and was not engaged in a continuing criminal enterprise, as defined in section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act; and

(5) not later than the time of the sentencing hearing, the defendant has truthfully provided to the Government all information and evidence the defendant has concerning the offense or offenses that were part of the same course of conduct or of a common scheme or plan, but the fact that the defendant has no relevant or useful other information to provide or that the Government is already aware of the information shall not preclude a determination by the court that the defendant has complied with this requirement.

CREDIT(S)

(Added Pub.L. 98-473, Title II, § 212(a)(2), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 1989; amended Pub.L. 99-570, Title I, § 1007(a), Oct. 27, 1986, 100 Stat. 3207-7; Pub.L. 99-646, §§ 8(a), 9(a), 80(a), 81(a), Nov. 10, 1986, 100 Stat. 3593, 3619; Pub.L. 100-182, §§ 3, 16(a), 17, Dec. 7, 1987, 101 Stat. 1266, 1269, 1270; Pub.L. 100-690, Title VII, § 7102, Nov. 18, 1988, 102 Stat. 4416; Pub.L. 103-322, Title VIII, § 80001(a), Title XXVIII, § 280001, Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 1985, 2095; Pub.L. 104-294, Title VI, § 601(b)(5), (6), (h), Oct. 11, 1996, 110 Stat. 3499, 3500; Pub.L. 107-273, Div. B, Title IV, § 4002(a)(8), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1807; Pub.L. 108-21, Title IV, § 401(a), (c), (j)(5), Apr. 30, 2003, 117 Stat. 667, 669, 673; Pub.L. 111-174, § 4, May 27, 2010, 124 Stat. 1216.)

Footnotes

- 1 So in original. The period probably should be a semicolon.
- 2 So in original. No subpar. (B) has been enacted.
- 3 So in original. The second comma probably should not appear.

18 U.S.C.A. § 3553, 18 USCA § 3553

Current through P.L. 115-231. Also includes P.L. 115-233 to 115-250 and 115-253. Title 26 current through P.L. 115-253.