UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6323

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEFFREY ROY CROSBY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (4:96-cr-00361-CMC-1)

Submitted: August 27, 2026 Decided: August 31, 2026

Before KING, HEYTENS, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeffrey Roy Crosby, Appellant Pro Se. Andrea Gwen Hoffman, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey Roy Crosby appeals the district court's order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) motion for compassionate release. We review a district court's denial of compassionate release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Brown*, 78 F.4th 122, 127 (4th Cir. 2023). Under this standard, "we may only find a district court abused its discretion when it acted arbitrarily or irrationally, failed to consider judicially recognized factors constraining its exercise of discretion, relied on erroneous factual or legal premises, or committed an error of law." *United States v. Burleigh*, 145 F.4th 541, 548 (4th Cir. 2025) (citation modified). "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." *Brown*, 78 F.4th at 128 (citation modified).

We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Crosby's motion. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Crosby*, No. 4:96-cr-00361-CMC-1 (D.S.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