

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-6505**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DANNY L. BLACKMON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at  
Wilmington. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (7:03-cr-00077-BO-1)

---

Submitted: January 29, 2024

Decided: February 1, 2024

---

Before THACKER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Danny L. Blackmon, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Danny L. Blackmon appeals from the district court's order denying his motion for compassionate release. Upon our review of the record, we affirm.

A district court may grant a motion for compassionate release after concluding that the defendant has shown extraordinary and compelling reasons supporting release, and that release is appropriate under the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors. *United States v. Brown*, 78 F.4th 122, 128 (4th Cir. 2023). We review a district court's denial of a motion for compassionate release for abuse of discretion. *Id.* at 127. When considering a defendant's motion for compassionate release, a court must “set forth enough to satisfy [our] court that [it] has *considered* the parties' arguments and has *a reasoned basis* for exercising [its] own legal decisionmaking authority,' so as to 'allow for meaningful appellate review.’” *United States v. High*, 997 F.3d 181, 190 (4th Cir. 2021) (quoting *Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1959, 1965 (2018)).

We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in deciding that, despite Blackmon's medical issues, the § 3553(a) sentencing factors weighed against granting compassionate release.

Accordingly, 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*