

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-14510
Non-Argument Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

LUIS DOMINGUEZ LOPEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 1:25-cr-20275-RKA-1

Before WILLIAM PRYOR, Chief Judge, and NEWSOM and BRASHER,
Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Luis Dominguez Lopez appeals his 151-month prison sentence for distribution of methamphetamine. 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1),

(b)(1)(B)(viii). Because Dominguez Lopez invited any alleged error, we affirm.

Dominguez Lopez pleaded guilty to distribution of 50 grams or more of methamphetamine, its salts, isomers, and salts of its isomers. 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(viii). A probation officer prepared a presentence investigation report that calculated a base offense level of 32, U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(a)(5), (c)(3), and added two levels because the offense involved the possession of a firearm, *id.* § 2D1.1(b)(1). The report then subtracted three levels for acceptance of responsibility, *id.* § 3E1.1(a)-(b), resulting in a total offense level of 31. The report calculated a criminal history category of IV based on 9 criminal history points, resulting in a guideline range of imprisonment of 151 to 188 months with a statutory range of 10 years to life imprisonment.

At sentencing, Dominguez Lopez did not object to the guideline calculation and requested “a sentence at the low end” of his guideline range. The district court sentenced him to 151 months of imprisonment followed by 5 years of supervised release based on the severity of the offense, Dominguez Lopez’s history and characteristics, including an “extremely extensive criminal history,” and the need to protect the public as well as promote just punishment and respect for the law. The district court stated that “even though [Dominguez Lopez] ha[d] maybe the most extensive criminal history [the court] ha[d] ever seen,” and that he had received “freebies” for many of his convictions because they did not

25-14510

Opinion of the Court

3

result in any criminal history points, the district court agreed that a sentence at the low end of the guideline range was appropriate.

Dominguez Lopez argues that his sentence is unreasonable because the district court placed undue weight on prior convictions that did not count towards his criminal history score. But he invited any error about the reasonableness of his sentence by requesting a sentence at the low end of his guideline range. “[A] party may not challenge as error a ruling or other trial proceeding invited by that party.” *United States v. Love*, 449 F.3d 1154, 1157 (11th Cir. 2006) (quoting *United States v. Ross*, 131 F.3d 970, 988 (11th Cir. 1997)).

AFFIRMED.