

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-7217

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER JERMAINE TAYLOR, a/k/a Phoenix, a/k/a C-Murda,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 20-7673

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER JERMAINE TAYLOR, a/k/a Phoenix, a/k/a C-Murda,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 20-7750

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER JERMAINE TAYLOR, a/k/a Phoenix, a/k/a C-Murda,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia,
at Huntington. Robert C. Chambers, District Judge. (3:15-cr-00009-1)

Submitted: April 16, 2021

Decided: May 10, 2021

Before AGEE and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher Jermaine Taylor, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Jermaine Taylor appeals the district court's orders denying his motions for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), as amended by the First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, § 603(b)(1), 132 Stat. 5194, 5239, and denying his motion for reconsideration. After reviewing the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Taylor's compassionate release motions. *See United States v. Kibble*, __F.3d __, __, No. 20-7009, 2021 WL 1216543, at *2 (4th Cir. Apr. 1, 2021) (stating standard of review). Further, we discern no reversible error in the district court's denial of Taylor's reconsideration motion.

On appeal, Taylor also contends that the district judge should have recused himself. Because Taylor did not move the district court for recusal, we review his claim only for plain error. *See United States v. Minard*, 856 F.3d 555, 557 (8th Cir. 2017) (stating standard of review). Taylor fails to establish that recusal was required. *See Belue v. Leventhal*, 640 F.3d 567, 572-74 (4th Cir. 2011) (discussing valid bases for bias or partiality motion); *United States v. Lentz*, 524 F.3d 501, 530 (4th Cir. 2008) ("The presiding judge is not required to recuse himself simply because of unsupported, irrational or highly tenuous speculation." (internal quotation marks and ellipsis omitted)).

Accordingly, we grant Taylor's motion to extend the filing time for a supplemental informal brief and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *United States v. Taylor*, No. 3:15-cr-00009-1 (S.D.W. Va. Aug. 10, 2020, Nov. 3, 2020, & Nov. 18, 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