

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-6185

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

IVAN ERNESTO ARROYO PARRA,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (1:22-cr-00022-WO-1)

Submitted: June 23, 2026

Decided: July 1, 2026

Before KING and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ivan Ernesto Arroyo Parra, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ivan Ernesto Arroyo Parra appeals the district court's order denying an 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) motion seeking a sentence reduction under Subpart 1 of Part B of Amendment 821 to the Sentencing Guidelines. We have reviewed the record and Parra's arguments on appeal, and we find no reversible error. We thus affirm.

“Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582, a court generally may not modify a sentence once it has been imposed.” *United States v. Melvin*, 105 F.4th 620, 623 (4th Cir. 2024) (internal quotation marks omitted). But, a district court may “reduce a defendant's sentence where the original ‘term of imprisonment [was] based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission.’” *United States v. Spruhan*, 989 F.3d 266, 268 (4th Cir. 2021) (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)). In this Circuit, “when evaluating the sufficiency of a sentencing court's explanation, there is a presumption that the district court sufficiently considered relevant factors in deciding a [§ 3582(c)(2) motion,” but “the presumption is not irrebuttable.” *United States v. Martin*, 916 F.3d 389, 396 (4th Cir. 2019). A more detailed explanation may be required when a defendant provides significant evidence of mitigating factors not available at sentencing. *Id.* at 396-98; see *Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 585 U.S. 109, 119 (2018).

We review the district court's denial of a § 3582(c)(2) motion for abuse of discretion. *Spruhan*, 989 F.3d at 269. On appeal, Parra contends that the district court erred in denying the § 3582(c)(2) motion without explaining the denial in its written order. But the district court explained its reasons for denying the motion in the statement of reasons appended to the denial ruling. Moreover, to the extent Parra contends that the

court's explanation was insufficient, we conclude that he has not rebutted the presumption that the court considered relevant factors when denying the motion. *See Martin*, 916 F.3d at 396.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Parra*, No. 1:22-cr-00022-WO-1 (M.D.N.C. Jan. 30, 2024). 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