

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-50725

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 27, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

EUGENIO HERNANDEZ VILLA,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 6:99-CR-13-8

Before GRAVES, HO, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Eugenio Hernandez Villa, federal prisoner # 01208-180, seeks to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) from the denial of his motion for compassionate release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i). By moving for leave to proceed IFP, Hernandez Villa is challenging the district court's certification that the appeal is not taken in good faith. *See Baugh v. Taylor*, 117 F.3d 197, 202 (5th Cir. 1997).

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

No. 25-50725

The district court determined that, even if Hernandez Villa had shown compelling or extraordinary reasons for a sentence reduction, he failed to demonstrate that he did not pose a danger to the safety of others and that the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors did not support an early release. It was not obligated to provide further reasoning to support the denial of Hernandez Villa's sixth motion seeking compassionate release. *See Concepcion v. United States*, 597 U.S. 481, 501 (2022); *Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 585 U.S. 109, 116 (2018). Moreover, the district court incorporated by reference its April 29, 2024 order denying Hernandez Villa's fourth § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion for compassionate release, which provided a more detailed explanation of why the § 3553(a) sentencing factors did not warrant relief. Hernandez Villa's arguments amount to nothing more than disagreement with the district court's balancing of the § 3553(a) factors, which "is not a sufficient ground for reversal." *United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 694 (5th Cir. 2020); *see United States v. Jackson*, 27 F.4th 1088, 1093 n.8 (5th Cir. 2022).

As Hernandez Villa fails to demonstrate a nonfrivolous issue regarding whether the district court abused its discretion in denying his § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) motion, *see Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693; *Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983), his IFP motion is DENIED, and the appeal is DISMISSED as frivolous. *See Baugh*, 117 F.3d at 202 n.24; 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.