

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-30347
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit
FILED
February 13, 2026

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

ANTHONY L. WILLIAMS,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 5:24-CR-148-1

Before RICHMAN, SOUTHWICK, and WILLETT, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Anthony L. Williams challenges the substantive reasonableness of the 240-month prison term he received for possession with intent to distribute 50 grams or more of methamphetamine, following a determination that he qualified as a career offender under U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1(b). We review the sentence under an abuse of discretion standard and apply a rebuttable

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

No. 25-30347

presumption of reasonableness to the below-Guidelines sentence. *See United States v. Hill*, 80 F.4th 595, 606 (5th Cir. 2023). Our review is “highly deferential, because the sentencing court is in a better position to find facts and judge their import under the § 3553(a) factors with respect to a particular defendant.” *United States v. Diehl*, 775 F.3d 714, 724 (5th Cir. 2015) (quotation omitted).

According to Williams, the district court failed to give adequate weight to several factors: his substantial assistance to the Government in a fraud investigation; the role his addiction and personal losses played in his conduct; his genuine acceptance of responsibility, remorse, and intent to address the causes of his addiction; sentencing data showing the extent of downward variances typically received by career offenders; his age of 47 at the time of conviction; his criminal history placing him at the bottom of category IV without the career offender designation; the age and nonviolent nature of his criminal history; and his employment history and earning capacity.

These arguments mirror those Williams made for a lower sentence in the district court, such that he is “effectively asking us to reweigh the district court’s calculus of the relevant factors, which we will not do.” *United States v. Douglas*, 957 F.3d 602, 609–10 (5th Cir. 2020). Williams’ contentions amount to a disagreement with the district court’s sentence and fail to rebut the presumption that his below-Guidelines sentence was reasonable. *See United States v. Fatani*, 125 F.4th 755, 762 (5th Cir. 2025).

AFFIRMED.