

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-3237

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Jose DeJesus Mejia-Fraijo

Defendant - Appellant

No. 25-3242

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Jose DeJesus Mejia-Fraijo

Defendant - Appellant

Appeals from United States District Court
for the Northern District of Iowa - Western

Submitted: May 19, 2026
Filed: May 22, 2026
[Unpublished]

Before BENTON, GRASZ, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Jose Mejia-Fraijo appeals after he pleaded guilty to illegal reentry as a felon, which also resulted in the district court¹ revoking his supervised release in an earlier case. His counsel has moved for leave to withdraw under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and has filed a brief challenging the substantive reasonableness of both sentences.

Having carefully reviewed the record, we conclude that Mejia-Fraijo's sentences are not unreasonable, as there is no indication that the district court failed to consider the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, gave significant weight to an improper or irrelevant factor, or committed a clear error of judgment in weighing the relevant factors. See *United States v. Feemster*, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (standard of review; sentence may be unreasonable if district court fails to consider relevant factor, gives significant weight to improper or irrelevant factor, or commits clear error of judgment in weighing appropriate factors); *United States v. Valure*, 835 F.3d 789, 790 (8th Cir. 2016) (standard of review for revocation sentences); *United States v. Callaway*, 762 F.3d 754, 760 (8th Cir. 2014) (on appeal, within-Guidelines-range sentence may be presumed reasonable); *United States v.*

¹The Honorable Leonard T. Strand, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

Beckwith, 57 F.4th 630, 632 (8th Cir. 2023) (per curiam) (revocation sentence within Guidelines range is accorded a presumption of substantive reasonableness on appeal).

We have also independently reviewed the record under *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), and we find no non-frivolous issues for appeal. Accordingly, we grant counsel leave to withdraw, and we affirm.
