

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

February 6, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 23-50609

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

JOSE LUIS CORRALES,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:14-CR-491-1

---

Before JOLLY, ENGELHARDT, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Jose Luis Corrales, federal prisoner # 35976-177, appeals from the district court's denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion for compassionate release. On appeal, Corrales contends that his counsel rendered ineffective assistance in connection with his guilty plea and sentencing; his guilty plea was involuntary; and that several trial court errors occurred with respect to his guilty plea and his sentencing. Based on these

---

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

No. 23-50609

claims, he implicitly argues that those factors constitute sufficiently extraordinary and compelling circumstances justifying compassionate release. He further argues that the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors weigh in favor of his compassionate release.

We review the denial of Corrales’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). “[A] prisoner cannot use § 3582(c) to challenge the legality or the duration of his sentence. . . .” *United States v. Escajeda*, 58 F.4th 184, 187 (5th Cir. 2023). As such, Corrales fails to demonstrate that extraordinary and compelling circumstances justify compassionate release. Furthermore, Corrales does not meaningfully challenge the district court’s conclusion that the § 3553(a) factors weighed against compassionate release. *See United States v. Scroggins*, 599 F.3d 433, 446-47 (5th Cir. 2010). Accordingly, he fails to demonstrate that the district court abused its discretion in denying his motion. *See Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693. The judgment of the district court is therefore, in all respects,

AFFIRMED.