

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-6575

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ERIC DEAN SMITH, a/k/a Big E,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (3:14-cr-00736-TLW-1)

Submitted: January 25, 2024

Decided: January 30, 2024

Before KING, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric Dean Smith, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric Dean Smith appeals from the district court’s order denying his motion to reconsider the denial of compassionate release. Upon our review of the record, we affirm.

“To grant a compassionate release motion, the district court must conclude that the prisoner is eligible for a sentence reduction because he has shown extraordinary and compelling reasons supporting relief, and that release is appropriate under the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors, to the extent those factors are applicable.” *United States v. Brown*, 78 F.4th 122, 128 (4th Cir. 2023) (alterations and internal quotation marks omitted). 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 Smith’s medical issues, the § 3553(a) sentencing factors—specifically the seriousness of Smith’s offense and criminal history—weighed against granting compassionate release. This is especially true since “the district judge who considered [Smith]’s motion for a sentence reduction was the same judge who had sentenced him originally.” *High*, 997 F.3d at 189 (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted).

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