

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6705

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SHANNON POULSON, a/k/a SB,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Elizabeth W. Hanes, District Judge. (2:18-cr-00049-EWH-DEM-1)

Submitted: May 28, 2026

Decided: June 1, 2026

Before WYNN, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shannon Poulson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Shannon Poulson appeals the district court’s order denying relief on his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) motion for compassionate release.* We “review[] the denial of compassionate release motions pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) for an abuse of discretion.” *United States v. Brown*, 78 F.4th 122, 127 (4th Cir. 2023). “In doing so, we ensure that the district court has not acted arbitrarily or irrationally, has followed the statutory requirements, and has conducted the necessary analysis for exercising its discretion.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

“In analyzing a motion for compassionate release, district courts must determine: (1) whether extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction; and (2) that such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.” *United States v. Malone*, 57 F.4th 167, 173 (4th Cir. 2023). “Only after this analysis may the district court grant the motion if (3) the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, to the extent they are applicable, favor release.” *Id.*

On appeal, Poulson argues that compassionate release is warranted because he has exhibited extraordinary rehabilitation and because he wishes to provide care for his ailing mother. We find no abuse of discretion in the district court’s denial of relief. The district court addressed Poulson’s rehabilitation efforts, finding them commendable but standard, and concluded Poulson had failed to establish that he was the sole, available caretaker for

* Poulson also filed a motion to appoint counsel. We deny that motion.

his mother. Nor did the court abuse its discretion in finding that the § 3553(a) factors weighed against reducing Poulson's sentence.

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