

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6179

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

OBINWANNE OKEKE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith, Senior District Judge. (4:19-cr-00084-RBS-RJK-
1)

Submitted: July 24, 2025

Decided: July 29, 2025

Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Obinwanne Okeke, Appellant Pro Se. Brian James Samuels, Assistant United States
Attorney, Newport News, Virginia, James Reed Sawyers, OFFICE OF THE UNITED
STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Obinwanne Okeke appeals the district court's order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) motion for compassionate release. We review a district court's denial of a motion for compassionate release for 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 (cleaned up).

We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in determining that Okeke failed to identify an extraordinary and compelling reason to grant relief and that, even if he had, the § 3553(a) factors counseled against a sentence reduction. Accordingly, we deny Okeke's motion to appoint counsel and affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Okeke*, No. 4:19-cr-00084-RBS-RJK-1 (E.D. Va. Feb. 25, 2025). 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