

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 25-6824**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LEROY DONNELL DIXON, SR., a/k/a Roy,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., Senior District Judge. (3:21-cr-00390-JFA-1)

---

Submitted: April 28, 2026

Decided: May 1, 2026

---

Before WILKINSON and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit  
Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Leroy Donnell Dixon, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. Frederick Michael O'Mara, Assistant United  
States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South  
Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Leroy Donnell Dixon, Sr., 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 under § 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). “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.” *Id.* at 128 (citation modified).

On appeal, Dixon challenges the district court’s conclusion that he failed to demonstrate extraordinary and compelling reasons for release. We discern no abuse of discretion. The district court adequately addressed Dixon’s arguments that his health conditions constituted extraordinary and compelling reasons for release and explained why it rejected his arguments. 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*