

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-10675
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

November 1, 2023

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

JIMMY STEELE,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:08-CR-87-1

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

PER CURIAM:*

Jimmy Steele, federal prisoner #36989-177, appeals the denial of his motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i), and the denial of his motion for reconsideration. He argues that the district court abused its discretion by failing to consider the factors Steele argued weighed

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

No. 23-10675

in favor of a sentence reduction and failing to adequately explain its reason for denying Steele's motion.

We review each denial for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020); *United States v. Rabhan*, 540 F.3d 344, 346–47 (5th Cir. 2008). The district court's order demonstrates that it considered and rejected Steele's arguments. *See Concepcion v. United States*, 142 S. Ct. 2389, 2405 (2022); *United States v. Escajeda*, 58 F.4th 184, 188 (5th Cir. 2023); *United States v. Evans*, 587 F.3d 667, 673 (5th Cir. 2009). The district court's order states that it considered the motion, the record, and applicable authorities and concluded that the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors did not weigh in favor of relief. Steele "may disagree with how the district court balanced the § 3553(a) factors, [but] that is not a sufficient ground for reversal." *Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 694.

Because the district court did not abuse its discretion in holding that relief was unwarranted under § 3553(a), we need not consider Steele's argument that the district court erred in finding that he failed to show extraordinary and compelling reasons warranting relief. *See United States v. Ward*, 11 F.4th 354, 360–61 (5th Cir. 2021); *Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693.

Further, Steele has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motion for reconsideration. *See Rabhan*, 540 F.3d at 346–47.

Accordingly, the judgment is AFFIRMED.