United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit
FILED
November 4, 2026
Thomas B. Plunkett, III
Clerk

No. 25-51063
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

ROBERT TIMOTHY BLAKE,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 5:15-CR-66-1

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:[*]

Robert Timothy Blake, federal prisoner # 46959-380, appeals the district court's denial of his motions for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) and for reconsideration. Blake contends that the district court abused its discretion in finding that he had not demonstrated extraordinary and compelling reasons warranting relief; contests the district court's conclusion that he is addicted to child pornography; and argues that

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

the district court's analysis of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors was based on false information introduced at the original sentencing hearing.

Although Blake is a first-time offender, the presentence report (PSR) reflects that 602 image files and 205 video files involving child pornography were discovered on his digital devices pursuant to a search warrant. Federal agents also discovered pictures of young children at the bus stop in front of Blake's home, as well as images of children playing in the nude at a residence directly behind Blake's home. The district court's conclusion that Blake was addicted to child pornography was a reasonable inference from the evidence presented in the criminal proceedings and adequately justifies the denial of relief. *See Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 585 U.S. 109, 117-19 (2018). To the extent Blake challenges the facts used in his original sentencing hearing, such an argument is not appropriately raised in a § 3582(c)(1)(A) proceeding. *See United States v. Hernandez*, 645 F.3d 709, 712 (5th Cir. 2011). At most, Blake's arguments amount to a mere disagreement with the district court's balancing of the § 3553(a) sentencing factors, which does not warrant reversal. *See United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 694 (5th Cir. 2020).

Accordingly, the order of the district court is AFFIRMED. *See id.* at 693-94; *United States v. Jackson*, 27 F.4th 1088, 1093 n.8 (5th Cir. 2022). Blake's motions for the appointment of counsel and to supplement the record on appeal are DENIED.