

JUN 21 2013

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellee,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>MATILDA LUCILLE JIM,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant - Appellant.</p>

No. 12-30293

D.C. No. 2:08-cr-02070-LRS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Washington
Lonny R. Suko, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 18, 2013**

Before: TALLMAN, M. SMITH, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Matilda Lucille Jim appeals from the district court’s judgment and challenges the 31-month term of supervised release imposed following revocation of supervised release. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Jim contends that the district court procedurally erred by failing to explain adequately the basis for imposing a 31-month term of supervised release. The record reflects that the court considered Jim's arguments and adequately explained the reasons for the sentence, including safety to the public and incentive for Jim to comply with the term of supervised release. *See United States v. Carty*, 520 F.3d 984, 992 (9th Cir. 2008) (en banc).

Jim also contends that her sentence is substantively unreasonable. The district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing Jim's sentence. *See Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). The sentence is substantively reasonable in light of the 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e) sentencing factors and the totality of the circumstances, including Jim's history and the need to protect the public. *See id.*; *United States v. Simtob*, 485 F.3d 1058, 1062-63 (9th Cir. 2007).

AFFIRMED.