

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

October 28, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 21-40169  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

CATHERINE PAULINE THOMPSON,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 5:11-CR-705-1

---

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

PER CURIAM:\*

Defendant-Appellant Catherine Pauline Thompson, federal prisoner # 89703-279, challenges the district court's denial of her motion for a compassionate release reduction of her sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i). She contends on appeal that the district court abused its

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.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. 21-40169

discretion in denying her motion, claiming that the court applied an incomplete or unreasonable view of the facts and record.

We review a district court's decision to deny a prisoner's compassionate release motion for abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020). A district court may modify a defendant's term of imprisonment, after considering the applicable 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, if the court concludes that "extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction." § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i).

Here, the district court denied Thompson's motion based on a finding that the § 3553(a) factors necessitated her continued imprisonment. *See Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693–94. It clearly articulated the reasons it so concluded, identifying the relevant factors as well as the facts underlying its reasoning. *See id.* at 693. Thompson has not identified any way in which the district court's assessment of the record was clearly erroneous, and her disagreement with its weighing of the sentencing factors is not sufficient to demonstrate an abuse of discretion. *See id.* at 693–94.

The district court's order is AFFIRMED.