## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 22-6790		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Α,		
Plaintiff - Ap	pellee,		
v.			
DAVID ANTHONY ROBINSON	Γ,		
Defendant - A	Appellant,		
	No. 22-6792		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	١,		
Plaintiff - Ap	pellee,		
v.			
DAVID ANTHONY ROBINSON	Γ,		
Defendant - A	Appellant.		
Appeals from the United States D George L. Russell, III, District Juc			
Submitted: December 20, 2022		Decided:	December 27, 20

Before NIEMEYER and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.
Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.
David Anthony Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. Kenneth Sutherland Clark, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

David Anthony Robinson appeals the district court's order denying his motions for compassionate release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), as amended by the First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194. We review the district court's order for abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Kibble*, 992 F.3d 326, 329 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 142 S. Ct. 383 (2021). A district court abuses its discretion when it "acts arbitrarily or irrationally, . . . fails to consider judicially recognized factors constraining its exercise of discretion, . . . relies on erroneous factual or legal premises, or . . . commits an error of law." *United States v. High*, 997 F.3d 181, 187 (4th Cir. 2021) (cleaned up). After reviewing the record in this case, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in weighing the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and concluding they did not support granting Robinson's motions. Therefore, we affirm the district court's order. 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**