

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-7049

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LORENZO BUTTS, a/k/a Lorenza Butts, a/k/a Lorenzo Butts, Jr.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen, District Judge. (2:00-cr-00067-AWA-1)

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 27, 2026

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lorenzo Butts, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lorenzo Butts appeals the district court’s order denying his emergency motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

“This Court reviews the denial of compassionate release motions . . . for an abuse of discretion.” *United States v. Brown*, 78 F.4th 122, 127 (4th Cir. 2023). “Under this standard, we may not substitute our judgment for that of the district court.” *United States v. Washington*, 161 F.4th 816, 820 (4th Cir. 2025) (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted). Rather, “we may only 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 other words, “an abuse of discretion is when the district judge is fundamentally wrong, not when we disagree with the district court’s judgment.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

“A district court analyzes a compassionate release motion in two steps.” *United States v. Moody*, 115 F.4th 304, 310 (4th Cir. 2024). At the first step, the court “determines whether the defendant is eligible for a sentence reduction. To be eligible, the court must find that relief is warranted because of extraordinary and compelling reasons and consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission.” *Id.* (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). At the second step, “the court considers whether the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors support relief.” *Id.*

Here, the district court found that Butts’s medical condition qualified as an extraordinary and compelling reason for compassionate release but denied relief based on

its assessment of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors. We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in finding that the extremely serious nature of Butts's offense conduct, his extensive criminal history, and the need to promote respect for law counseled against granting his emergency motion for compassionate release.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment.* 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

* We deny Butts's motion for an evidentiary hearing.