

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 24 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

HUGO EDUARDO PULIDO-AVINA,
AKA Hugo Eduardo Pulido-Avina, AKA
Hugo Eduardo Pulido,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-4915

D.C. No.

2:21-cr-00396-FLA-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 22, 2026**

Before: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Hugo Eduardo Pulido-Avina appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges the 12-month sentence imposed upon 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 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).

Pulido-Avina contends that 12-month sentence, which is at the high end of the applicable Guidelines range, is substantively unreasonable because (1) the court gave insufficient weight to his mitigating circumstances, and (2) the sentence is too long when compared to the sentences he received in his prior federal and state cases. We review this claim for abuse of discretion. *See Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing the 12-month sentence, which is substantively reasonable under the 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e) sentencing factors and the totality of the circumstances, including Pulido-Avina's history of illegal reentry convictions, supervised release violations, and state offenses. *See Gall*, 552 U.S. at 51. Pulido-Avina's "mere disagreement" with how the district court weighed those circumstances against his mitigating arguments does not amount to abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Dunn*, 728 F.3d 1151, 1159 (9th Cir. 2013). Moreover, notwithstanding the length of Pulido-Avina's other sentences, he has not shown any abuse of discretion in the court's conclusion that his "significant" breach of the court's trust, and the need to deter and to protect the public, warranted a high-end sentence.

Pulido-Avina's motion to expedite this appeal is denied as moot.

AFFIRMED.