

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

April 29, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 21-50196  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

JESUS GREGORIO MACIAS-MUNOZ,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:92-CR-132-1

---

Before SOUTHWICK, OLDHAM, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Jesus Gregorio Macias-Munoz, federal prisoner # 62259-080, appeals the district court's denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion for compassionate release. He contends that the district court abused its discretion by improperly relying on the policy statement in U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.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. 21-50196

to determine that he failed to show extraordinary and compelling reasons warranting relief. *See United States v. Shkambi*, 993 F.3d 388, 392-93 (5th Cir. 2021). In addition, Macias-Munoz argues that the district court did not independently consider the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and contends that the district court should have given more weight to factors that tilted in his favor.

Here, the court adequately considered Macias-Munoz's arguments, and the record supports its conclusion that the § 3553(a) factors weighed against release. *See Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1959, 1965 (2018). Macias-Munoz has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying relief. *See United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020). Because the district court's independent § 3553(a) analysis supports the dismissal, it is unnecessary to consider Macias-Munoz'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 judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.