UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6306

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TERRANCE LAMONT MOORE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. Richard E. Myers, II, Chief District Judge. (4:98-cr-00013-M-1)

Submitted: July 20, 2026 Decided: August 14, 2026

Before WILKINSON and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Terrance Lamont Moore, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Terrance Lamont Moore appeals the district court's order denying his motion for reconsideration and his subsequent motion for compassionate release.[*] Our review of the record leads us to conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Moore's motion to reconsider. *See United States v. Kalb*, 891 F.3d 455, 467 (3d Cir. 2018) (stating standard of review); *see also Rutherford v. United States*, 146 S. Ct. 1320, 1335 (2026) (holding "Congress's nonretroactive change to [18 U.S.C.] § 924(c)—considered by itself or in combination with other factors—cannot make a prisoner eligible for compassionate release"). Nor do we discern any abuse of discretion in the district court's finding that Moore's subsequent motion for compassionate release did not establish extraordinary and compelling reasons for his release. *See United States v. Davis*, 99 F.4th 647, 653 (4th Cir. 2024) (stating standard of review); *see also* U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.13(d), p.s. (2025) (providing that "rehabilitation of the defendant is not, by itself, an extraordinary and compelling reason for" compassionate release).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Moore*, No. 4:98-cr-00013-M-1 (E.D.N.C. Apr. 1, 2025). 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

[*] Moore has moved for assignment of counsel on appeal and for reassignment of his case on remand. We deny the motion for assignment of counsel, and we deny as moot the motion for reassignment.