

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 08-1809

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JOSE PEREZ-CORDERO,
Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Criminal No. 06-cr-00184-001)
District Judge: Honorable James M. Munley

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
July 13, 2009

Before: RENDELL, FUENTES and ROTH, Circuit Judges.

(Filed: July 27, 2009)

OPINION OF THE COURT

RENDELL, *Circuit Judge*.

This appeal raises a single issue: whether a district court may reduce a defendant's sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2), the statutory provision allowing a court to reduce a sentence which is "based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by

the Sentencing Commission,” when that sentence is imposed pursuant to a binding plea agreement. The District Court concluded that enforcement of the stipulated sentence was mandatory; defendant Jose Perez-Cordero appealed.¹ We conclusively resolved the issue in *United States v. Sanchez*, holding, “If ‘binding’ is to have meaning, it cannot be undone by the discretionary possibility of a different sentence under § 3582(c).” 562 F.3d 275, 282 (3d Cir. 2009).

Here, Perez-Cordero stipulated to the sentence imposed in a binding plea agreement under Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(c), the validity of which is undisputed.² Accordingly, we will AFFIRM the order of the District Court.

¹ The District Court had jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. § 3231. We exercise jurisdiction pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1291.

² Perez-Cordero also contends that the District Court should have conducted a hearing on whether a sentence reduction was appropriate under § 3582(c)(2). Because a sentence reduction was not permissible here, Perez-Cordero suffered no prejudice from the District Court’s refusal to hold a hearing.