

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 21-7090**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISAAC JEROME MACK,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.  
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (4:19-cr-00190-MGL-1)

---

Submitted: April 26, 2022

Decided: April 28, 2022

---

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Isaac Jerome Mack, Appellant Pro Se. Justin William Holloway, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Isaac Jerome Mack appeals the district court's order denying his motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A).<sup>\*</sup> We review a district court's denial of a compassionate release motion for abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Kibble*, 992 F.3d 326, 329 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 142 S. Ct. 383 (2021). Confining our review to the issues raised in the informal brief, *see* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014), we have reviewed the record and conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion and sufficiently explained the reasons for the denial, *see United States v. High*, 997 F.3d 181, 188-91 (4th Cir. 2021) (discussing amount of explanation required for denial of compassionate release motion). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Mack*, 4:19-cr-00190-MGL-1 (D.S.C. Apr. 19, 2021). We deny Mack's motion to appoint counsel. 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*

---

<sup>\*</sup> In his informal brief, Mack challenges various aspects of his sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). Because Mack did not raise these claims in the district court and does not present any exceptional circumstances, these issues are not properly before us. *In re Under Seal*, 749 F.3d 276, 285 (4th Cir. 2014) (“Our settled rule is simple: absent exceptional circumstances, we do not consider issues raised for the first time on appeal.” (cleaned up)).