

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 20-6733**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRADON MARQUEZ DRAYTON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Abingdon. James P. Jones, District Judge. (1:04-cr-00009-JPJ-1)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2020

Decided: November 20, 2020

---

Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Tradon Marquez Drayton, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer R. Bockhorst, Assistant United States Attorney, Abingdon, Virginia, Samuel Cagle Juhan, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlottesville, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tradon Marquez Drayton appeals the district court's order granting in part, and denying in part, Drayton's motion for a sentence reduction pursuant to the First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, § 404, 132 Stat. 5194, 5222. We have reviewed the record and find that the district court did not abuse its discretion in declining to further reduce Drayton's sentence. *See United States v. Jackson*, 952 F.3d 492, 495-97 (4th Cir. 2020) (reviewing decision on First Step Act motion for abuse of discretion). Specifically, in ruling on Drayton's motion, the court accurately described the record, including the sentencing reductions awarded Drayton since his initial sentencing in 2006; evaluated the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors; and explained its reasons for denying the motion in part. Further, upon review, we discern no legal error in the court declining to reduce the two consecutive sentences imposed on Drayton's convictions under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c), (j). *United States v. Chambers*, 956 F.3d 667, 671 (4th Cir. 2020) (explaining that we review de novo "the scope of a district court's sentencing authority under the First Step Act").

Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *United States v. Drayton*, No. 1:04-cr-00009-JPJ-1 (W.D. Va. May 12, 2020). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*AFFIRMED*