

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-7174

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEFFREY A. PLEASANT, a/k/a Jeffrey A. Pleasants,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:00-cr-00071-REP-RCY-1)

Submitted: April 18, 2024

Decided: April 19, 2024

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeffrey A. Pleasant, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey A. Pleasant, a federal prisoner, appeals the district court's orders granting in part his counseled motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) and denying reconsideration. Upon review, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in adjudicating Pleasant's compassionate release motion. *See United States v. Bethea*, 54 F.4th 826, 831, 834 (4th Cir. 2022) (noting standard of review, determinations district court must make before granting compassionate release motion, and guideposts for determining whether district court has abused its discretion in considering 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors). Specifically, in reducing Pleasant's sentence from 622 to 245 months' imprisonment, the court adequately considered Pleasant's arguments and explained why Pleasant's specific circumstances justified the extent of the reduction. And since the court ruled on Pleasant's counseled motion for compassionate release, it did not err by declining to also rule on his pro se motions for compassionate release. *See United States v. Miller*, 54 F.4th 219, 227 (4th Cir. 2022) (“[A] defendant has no right to hybrid representation for written motions.”).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. *United States v. Pleasant*, No. 3:00-cr-00071-REP-RCY-1 (E.D. Va. Oct. 6, 2023; Dec. 13, 2023). 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