

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 23-1408

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Altedias Maurice Campbell

Defendant - Appellant

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

Submitted: September 18, 2023

Filed: November 2, 2023

[Unpublished]

Before SHEPHERD, KELLY, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

After finding that Altedias Campbell violated the conditions of supervised release by assaulting his girlfriend, the district court¹ sent him back to prison for 14

¹The Honorable Linda R. Reade, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

months. Although he argues there was no violation and that his sentence is too long, we affirm.

First, sufficient evidence supported the finding that Campbell assaulted his girlfriend. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3). The victim herself testified—credibly, in the district court’s view—about the who, when, where, why, and how of the attack. A credibility determination like this one “is quintessentially a judgment call and virtually unassailable on appeal.” *United States v. Cates*, 613 F.3d 856, 858 (8th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted). So relying on her account, along with photographs of her injuries, was not clearly erroneous. *See United States v. Sistrunk*, 612 F.3d 988, 991 (8th Cir. 2010) (explaining that we will reverse only if we are left with a “definite and firm conviction” that the district court made a mistake (citation omitted)).

Second, to the extent Campbell challenges the sentence itself, we conclude it is substantively reasonable. *See United States v. Perkins*, 526 F.3d 1107, 1110 (8th Cir. 2008) (reviewing the reasonableness of a revocation sentence for an abuse of discretion). The record establishes that the district court sufficiently considered the statutory sentencing factors, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553(a), 3583(c), (e)(3), and did not rely on an improper factor or commit a clear error of judgment. *See United States v. Larison*, 432 F.3d 921, 923–24 (8th Cir. 2006). We accordingly affirm the judgment of the district court.
