

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

May 19, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 26-30130  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

CARTER MILES LEDOUX,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 2:26-CR-68-1

---

Before JONES, DUNCAN, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Carter Miles Ledoux was indicted in this proceeding for conspiracy to commit crimes against the United States, cyberstalking, transmission of threats through interstate commerce, and making a threat or maliciously false report concerning an attempt to harm someone or damage property by means of an explosive. In a separate proceeding, he was charged with possession of

---

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

No. 26-30130

child pornography. He appeals the district court's decision that revoked the magistrate judge's (MJ) order of release and ordered Ledoux's pretrial detention.

Ledoux contends that the district court gave inadequate reasons for its decision to reject the MJ's ruling. However, the district court's written order, if read in context, provided adequate reasons for the detention ruling. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i); FED. R. APP. P. 9(a).

Additionally, Ledoux argues that the district court's decision was not supported by the proceedings below. He asserts that a proper evaluation of the factors set out in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) establishes that there are conditions of release that will reasonably guarantee the safety of any other person and the community. The Government argues that the district court's detention ruling was supported by the proceedings. Because the district court issued its own decision and did not accept the MJ's ruling, we consider only the district court's order. *See United States v. Fortna*, 769 F.2d 243, 249 (5th Cir. 1985).

The evidence as a whole supports the district court's detention decision. *See United States v. Rueben*, 974 F.2d 580, 586 (5th Cir. 1992). The § 3142(g) factors all at least partially weigh in favor of pretrial detention. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g). Ledoux has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in deciding that he presents a danger and that no condition or combination of conditions would reasonably assure the safety of others and the community. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(1), (g); *Rueben*, 974 F.2d at 586; *United States v. Hare*, 873 F.2d 796, 798 (5th Cir. 1989).

**AFFIRMED.**