

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-7204

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

STEPHANIE DIANNA ELLIOTT, a/k/a Stephanie Wilson, a/k/a Stephanie Moore,
a/k/a Stephanie Russell, a/k/a Stephanie Hanchett, a/k/a Vicki Marsh, a/k/a Monica
Allen, a/k/a Melissa Standford, a/k/a Jennifer Taylor, a/k/a Heidi Litchford, a/k/a
Sandy Morehead, a/k/a Randy Morehead, a/k/a Katie Jones, a/k/a Sharon Mitchell,
a/k/a Sara James, a/k/a Janet Harrington, a/k/a Sharon Miller,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (5:21-cr-00142-D-1)

Submitted: May 15, 2025

Decided: May 20, 2025

Before NIEMEYER and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stephanie Dianna Elliott, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Stephanie Dianna Elliott appeals the district court's order denying relief on her 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) motions for a sentence reduction and dismissing her complaint against the Defense Logistics Agency and Department of Justice. Our review of the record reveals that the district court acted within its discretion in denying Elliott's motions for a sentence reduction. *See United States v. Mann*, 709 F.3d 301, 304 (4th Cir. 2013) (stating standard of review). The district court clearly understood its authority to reduce Elliott's sentence and recognized Elliott's postsentencing conduct, but it declined to grant a reduction based on its review of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors. Additionally, we discern no reversible error in the district court's dismissal of Elliott's complaint.

Accordingly, we deny Elliott's motion for appointment of counsel, and 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