

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

May 18, 2023

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 22-30591  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

QUINCY O. GUILLORY,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 2:02-CR-20062-1

---

Before STEWART, DUNCAN, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Quincy O. Guillory, federal prisoner # 11380-035, appeals the denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion for compassionate release. On appeal, Guillory contends that the district court erred in finding that he failed to demonstrate extraordinary and compelling reasons for granting relief. He additionally argues that the district court failed to acknowledge his exhibits

---

\* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 22-30591

or adequately consider or discuss his arguments regarding the applicability of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors that he contended weighed in favor of compassionate release.

We review the denial of Guillory's § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion for an abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020). In this case, while the district court's analysis was fairly curt on the point, the court adequately considered Guillory's arguments and concluded that consideration of the § 3553(a) factors did not weigh in favor of relief. *See Concepcion v. United States*, 142 S. Ct. 2389, 2405 (2022); *United States v. Evans*, 587 F.3d 667, 673 (5th Cir. 2009). To the extent that Guillory disagrees with the court's balancing of the § 3553(a) factors, his disagreement does not warrant reversal. *See Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 694.

We need not consider Guillory's contention that the district court erred in finding that he failed to show extraordinary and compelling reasons warranting relief because the district court did not abuse its discretion in its alternative holding that relief was not warranted under the § 3553(a) factors. *See United States v. Ward*, 11 F.4th 354, 360–62 (5th Cir. 2021); *Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693. The district court's decision is AFFIRMED.