

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 19, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 20-50895
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

TAWOINE BANKS,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 7:18-CR-82-4

Before WIENER, DENNIS, and HAYNES, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Tawoine Banks, federal prisoner # 21608-057, appeals the denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion for compassionate release. We review the denial for an abuse of discretion. *United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020).

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-50895

Even if a movant otherwise qualifies for a § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) reduction, a district court may deny relief based solely upon its consideration of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors. *Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693-94. While the district court must provide specific factual reasons for its decision to deny a motion for a sentence reduction, *id.* at 693, the amount of explanation needed depends “upon the circumstances of the particular case,” *Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1959, 1965 (2018) (citation omitted). “In some cases, it may be sufficient for purposes of appellate review that the judge simply relied upon the record, while making clear that he or she has considered the parties’ arguments and taken account of the § 3553(a) factors.” *Id.*

The district court catalogued the parties’ pleadings and explicitly stated that it had denied relief after considering, inter alia, the § 3553(a) factors; the district court thus indicated that it had considered the parties’ arguments, and it provided a sufficient, albeit brief, explanation for the denial. *See Chavez-Meza*, 138 S. Ct. at 1965-68. While Banks argues that the district court misbalanced the § 3553(a) factors, his disagreement does not warrant reversal. *See Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 694. He fails to show that the district court abused its discretion. *Id.* at 693.

The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.