

United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eighth Circuit

---

No. 21-2295

---

United States of America

*Plaintiff - Appellee*

v.

Patrelle Jose Green-Bowman

*Defendant - Appellant*

---

Appeal from United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Iowa - Eastern

---

Submitted: October 14, 2021

Filed: October 19, 2021

[Unpublished]

---

Before LOKEN, GRUENDER, and ERICKSON, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Patrelle Jose Green-Bowman appeals the sentence the district court<sup>1</sup> imposed after revoking his supervised release. His counsel has moved to withdraw and has filed a brief challenging the reasonableness of the sentence.

After careful review, we conclude the district court did not abuse its discretion by imposing an unreasonable sentence. See United States v. Miller, 557 F.3d 910, 915-16 (8th Cir. 2009) (standard of review). The record reflects the court sufficiently considered the relevant statutory sentencing factors and did not overlook a relevant factor, give significant weight to an improper or irrelevant factor, or commit a clear error of judgment in weighing relevant factors. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e); United States v. Keating, 579 F.3d 891, 893 (8th Cir. 2009). The sentence was below the statutory limits and within the applicable Sentencing Guidelines policy statement range. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583(b)(2), (e)(3), (h); USSG § 7B1.4(a); United States v. Perkins, 526 F.3d 1107, 1110 (8th Cir. 2008).

The written judgment conflicts, in part, with the district court’s oral findings at the revocation hearing. The oral pronouncement “prevails.” United States v. Raftis, 427 F.2d 1145, 1146 (8th Cir. 1970). A remand is unnecessary “where the written judgment contains apparent clerical errors and the district court’s intent is clear from the record.” United States v. Jacobs, 508 Fed. Appx. 576, 577-78 (8th Cir. 2013). As the record on appeal makes the court’s intent clear, we modify the written judgment in part to reflect that Green-Bowman admitted guilt to violations 5(a)-(f), that he was found to have committed violations of 5(g)-(h), that he was found not to be in violation of 3, and that the court did not make a finding regarding violation 4. See 28 U.S.C. § 2106. We affirm the judgment as so modified and grant counsel’s motion to withdraw.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable C.J. Williams, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.