United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-10554
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

CALVIN EASLEY,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:22-CR-4-1

Before ELROD, *Chief Judge*, and STEWART and HIGGINSON, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:[*]

Calvin Easley appeals the revocation of his term of supervised release. Specifically, he argues that the district court erred by finding that he had violated mandatory condition number one of his supervised release by assaulting a pregnant person.

---

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

No. 25-10554

We review a preserved challenge to a district court's decision to revoke supervised release for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Spraglin*, 418 F.3d 479, 480 (5th Cir. 2005). In reviewing a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence, we "must view the evidence and all reasonable inferences that may be drawn from the evidence in a light most favorable to the [G]overnment." *United States v. Alaniz-Alaniz*, 38 F.3d 788, 792 (5th Cir. 1994) (citation omitted).

In light of the evidence admitted at the revocation hearing, a reasonable trier of fact could conclude that it was more likely than not that Easley committed assault against a pregnant person. *See id.*; *see also United States v. Mitchell*, 709 F.3d 436, 442 n.14 (5th Cir. 2013); Tex. Penal Code § 22.01(a), (b)(8) (2024). Thus, the district court did not abuse its discretion in revoking Easley's supervised release based on, in part, his violation of mandatory condition number one. *See United States v. McCormick*, 54 F.3d 214, 219 (5th Cir. 1995). As a result, it did not err by sentencing Easley according to the higher advisory guidelines range applicable to a Grade B violation. *See id.*; Tex. Penal Code §§ 12.34(a), 22.01(a), (b)(8) (2024); U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1.

AFFIRMED.