[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the

United States Court of Appeals

For the Fleventh Circuit

No. 20-14397

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JEFFREY BEARD, II, a.k.a. JP,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida D.C. Docket No. 2:18-cr-00190-SPC-MRM-3

USCA11 Case: 20-14397 Date Filed: 06/30/2022 Page: 2 of 3

Opinion of the Court

20-14397

Before WILSON, BRANCH, and TJOFLAT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

2

This is Jeffrey Beard's appeal following his guilty plea and sentencing for drug crimes arising from his involvement in a wideranging drug trafficking ring that operated for several years in the Suncoast Estates neighborhood of Fort Myers, Florida. Along with other members of the drug ring, in November 2018, Beard was indicted for conspiracy to distribute cocaine, heroin, and fentanyl as well as for distribution of fentanyl. Beard pleaded guilty to those charges.

In November 2020, Beard was sentenced. The district court found that Beard was an "average" participant in the drug ring and therefore was not entitled to a minor-role reduction. The district court also adopted an obstruction-of-justice enhancement and declined to apply an acceptance-of-responsibility reduction based on Beard's assault of a cooperating co-conspirator in jail following his guilty plea. Taking into account the severity and extent of the drug ring's conspiracy conduct as well as Beard's substantial criminal history, the district court imposed a low-end withinguidelines sentence of 384 months in prison to be followed by five years of supervised release.¹

_

¹ Beard's guidelines range was 360–720 months and his statutory maximum was 720 months.

3

20-14397 Opinion of the Court

On appeal, Beard challenges the district court's decision not to adopt a minor-role reduction in calculating his guidelines range. Beard also challenges the district court's adoption of the obstruction-of-justice enhancement and corresponding denial of an acceptance-of-responsibility reduction. Finally, Beard challenges the procedural and substantive reasonableness of his sentence.

After thorough review and with the benefit of oral argument, we find no clear error in the district court's guidelines-related determinations. Nor do we find any abuse of discretion, procedural or substantive, in the district court's imposition of Beard's sentence. Accordingly, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.