NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 14-50026
Plaintiff - Appellee,	D.C. No. 3:09-cr-02986-GT
v.	
CARLOS RAMOS-SANCHEZ,	MEMORANDUM[*]
Defendant - Appellant.	

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Gordon Thompson, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 23, 2014[**]

Before: W. FLETCHER, RAWLINSON, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Carlos Ramos-Sanchez appeals from the district court's judgment and

challenges the 14-month consecutive sentence imposed upon revocation of

supervised release. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Ramos-Sanchez first contends that the district court erred by failing to (i)

---

[*]   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).

independently calculate the Sentencing Guidelines range, (ii) consider the

applicable 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors, other than deterrence, and (iii)

explain adequately the sentence imposed. We disagree. The record reflects that

the district court adopted the correctly-calculated Guidelines range provided by the

probation officer, adequately considered the applicable section 3553(a) sentencing

factors, and sufficiently explained the sentence. *See United States v. Carty*, 520

F.3d 984, 992-93 (9th Cir. 2008) (en banc).

Ramos-Sanchez also contends that his sentence is substantively

unreasonable. The district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing Ramos-

Sanchez's sentence. *See Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007). The 14-

month consecutive sentence is substantively reasonable in light of the totality of

the circumstances and the 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e) sentencing factors. *See* U.S.S.G.

§ 7B1.3(f); *Gall*, 552 U.S. at 51.

AFFIRMED.