

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-2255

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Conrado Perez

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Southern District of Iowa - Western

Submitted: August 19, 2026

Filed: August 24, 2026

[Unpublished]

Before KELLY, KOBES, and JUSTIN D. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Conrado Perez appeals after he pleaded guilty to drug and firearm offenses and the district court¹ sentenced him to 216 months in prison. On appeal, Perez argues

¹The Honorable Rebecca Goodgame Ebinger, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.

that 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) is unconstitutional in light of New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n, Inc. v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022), and challenges his sentence.

Upon careful review, we conclude that Perez’s constitutional challenge was foreclosed by this court’s prior precedent. See United States v. Jackson, 110 F.4th 1120, 1126 (8th Cir. 2024) (concluding that § 922(g)(1) is constitutional under Bruen; stating there is no need for felony-by-felony litigation regarding the constitutionality of § 922(g)(1); rejecting as-applied challenge where defendant’s prior convictions were for non-violent felonies). We also conclude that the district court did not err in determining that Perez’s offense involved the importation of methamphetamine, as the government presented adequate evidence that Perez had transported drugs acquired in Mexico back to Iowa. See United States v. Werkmeister, 62 F.4th 465, 468-69 (8th Cir. 2023) (reviewing interpretation of Guidelines de novo and factual findings for clear error).

Finally, we conclude that the district court did not impose a substantively unreasonable sentence, as the court properly considered the factors listed in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) and did not err in weighing the relevant factors. See United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (reviewing sentences for substantive reasonableness under deferential abuse of discretion standard; abuse of discretion occurs when the court fails to consider relevant factor, gives significant weight to an improper or irrelevant factor, or commits a clear error of judgment in weighing the appropriate factors). Further, the court imposed a sentence below the Guidelines range. See United States v. McCauley, 715 F.3d 1119, 1127 (8th Cir. 2013) (noting that when the district court has varied below the Guidelines range, it is “nearly inconceivable” that the court abused its discretion in not varying further).

Accordingly, we affirm.