

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-6776

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KEISHRON KO-SHE KILPATRICK,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (5:20-cr-00388-D-6)

Submitted: March 27, 2025

Decided: March 31, 2025

Before THACKER and BERNER, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Keishron Ko-She Kilpatrick, Appellant Pro Se. David A. Bragdon, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Keishron Ko-She Kilpatrick appeals the district court’s order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) motion for a sentence reduction pursuant to Amendment 821 to the United States Sentencing Guidelines (“U.S.S.G.”). Amendment 821 was a multi-part amendment. Part A of Amendment 821, amending U.S.S.G. § 4A1.1, limits the impact of “status points,” which are “additional criminal history points given to defendants for the fact of having committed the instant offense while under a criminal justice sentence, including probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, work release, or escape status.” U.S.S.G. § 1B1.10 cmt. n.7.

“We review a district court’s decision [whether] to reduce a sentence under [18 U.S.C.] § 3582(c)(2) de novo.” *United States v. Mann*, 709 F.3d 301, 304 (4th Cir. 2013). Our review of the record reveals no error. The court understood its authority to reduce Kilpatrick’s sentence and recognized Kilpatrick’s postsentencing rehabilitative conduct, but the court declined to grant a reduction based on its review of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors.

Accordingly, we deny Kilpatrick’s motion to appoint counsel and affirm the district court’s order. *United States v. Kilpatrick*, No. 5:20-cr-388-D-6 (E.D.N.C. Aug. 9, 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