

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

May 13, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 24-50536  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

MICHAEL ERIC WALLACE,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 7:12-CR-197-1

---

Before HAYNES, HIGGINSON, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:\*

Michael Eric Wallace, federal prisoner # 01809-380, appeals the denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion for compassionate release. Wallace contends that extraordinary and compelling reasons exist for his compassionate release, focusing on his health issues and the potential effects of COVID-19 and on his assertions that, because of changes in the law, the

---

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

No. 24-50536

sentence he received is an “unusually long sentence” under U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13(b)(6), p.s. (2023). He further maintains that the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors weigh in favor of granting him relief, given his lengthy sentence, his efforts at rehabilitation while in prison, and the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities. Although Wallace asserts that the district court erred in determining that he failed to exhaust administrative remedies and that he did not establish that he would not pose a danger to others or to the community, the court did not make such findings.

We review for abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693–94 (5th Cir. 2020). The district court conducted an independent review of the § 3553(a) factors and concluded that Wallace was not entitled to relief. Wallace has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in reaching this conclusion. *See id.* at 693. Because the district court’s independent § 3553(a) analysis supports the dismissal, it is unnecessary to consider Wallace’s arguments challenging the district court’s conclusion that he failed to show extraordinary and compelling reasons warranting relief. *See United States v. Jackson*, 27 F.4th 1088, 1093 n.8 (5th Cir. 2022); *Ward v. United States*, 11 F.4th 354, 360–62 (5th Cir. 2021). Accordingly, the district court’s decision is AFFIRMED.