

MAR 14 2017

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

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

MANUEL VALLE,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 16-10156

D.C. No. 2:02-cr-00213-MCE

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Morrison C. England, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 8, 2017\*\*

Before: LEAVY, W. FLETCHER, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Manuel Valle appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. Reviewing de novo, *see United States v. Leniear*, 574 F.3d 668, 672 (9th Cir. 2009), we affirm.

---

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

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

Valle contends that he is entitled to a sentence reduction under Amendment 782 to the Sentencing Guidelines. The district court properly concluded that Valle is ineligible for a sentence reduction because Amendment 782 did not lower his applicable sentencing range. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2); *Leniear*, 574 F.3d at 673-74. Moreover, because the court lacked authority to reduce Valle's sentence, it had no reason to consider the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors. *See Dillon v. United States*, 560 U.S. 817, 826-27 (2010).

**AFFIRMED.**