

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**For the Eighth Circuit**

---

No. 14-3526

---

United States of America

*Plaintiff - Appellee*

v.

Travis James Eaton

*Defendant - Appellant*

---

Appeal from United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Iowa - Ft. Dodge

---

Submitted: June 3, 2015

Filed: June 5, 2015

[Unpublished]

---

Before WOLLMAN, LOKEN, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Travis James Eaton directly appeals the 234-month sentence imposed by the district court<sup>1</sup> after he pled guilty to conspiring to distribute methamphetamine as a

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Linda R. Reade, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa.

second felony drug offender, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 846, and 851. In a brief filed under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), counsel argues that Eaton's sentence was substantively unreasonable. Having jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, this court affirms.

After careful review, this court concludes the sentence was not substantively unreasonable. The district court thoroughly analyzed the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors; noted Eaton's recidivism, failure to pursue drug rehabilitation, and possession of large amounts of high-quality methamphetamine and multiple weapons; and did not commit a clear error of judgment in weighing the sentencing factors. *See United States v. Deering*, 762 F.3d 783, 787 (8th Cir. 2014) (district court has wide latitude to weigh § 3553(a) factors and assign some factors greater weight than others in determining appropriate sentence); *United States v. Salazar-Aleman*, 741 F.3d 878, 881 (8th Cir. 2013) (under substantive review, district court abuses its discretion if it fails to consider relevant factor, gives significant weight to improper or irrelevant factor, or commits clear error of judgment in weighing factors); *United States v. Feemster*, 572 F.3d 455, 464 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (substantive review is narrow and deferential). This court notes that the extent of the district court's departure is not reviewable on appeal. *See Deering*, 762 F.3d at 786. An independent review of the record under *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), reveals no nonfrivolous issues for appeal.

The judgment is affirmed. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.

---