

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-4413**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALEXANDER O'NEAL JACKSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, Senior District Judge. (3:21-cr-00142-HEH-1)

---

Submitted: April 25, 2023

Decided: October 18, 2023

---

Before HARRIS and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**ON BRIEF:** Jeremy C. Kamens, Federal Public Defender, Patrick L. Bryant, Alexander, Virginia, Laura J. Koenig, Assistant Federal Public Defender, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellant. Jessica D. Aber, United States Attorney, Kenneth R. Simon, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alexander Jackson appeals from his 78-month sentence for possessing a firearm as a felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). Jackson contends that his sentence is procedurally unreasonable because the district court failed to adequately explain the sentence and failed to address his non-frivolous arguments for a different sentence.

We review a criminal sentence for reasonableness “under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard.” *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 41 (2007). “In determining procedural reasonableness, this Court considers whether the district court properly calculated the defendant’s advisory guidelines range, gave the parties an opportunity to argue for an appropriate sentence, considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, and sufficiently explained the selected sentence.” *United States v. Ross*, 912 F.3d 740, 744 (4th Cir. 2019) (citing *Gall*, 552 U.S. at 49–51). Having reviewed the record, we conclude the district court considered the nonfrivolous arguments Jackson actually advanced in support of a different sentence. We are also satisfied with the district court’s explanation of its sentencing decision. *See United States v. Arbaugh*, 951 F.3d 167, 174 (4th Cir. 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*