

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6242

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CALVIN SCOTT WEDINGTON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Richard D. Bennett, Senior District Judge. (1:82-cr-00086-RDB-1)

Submitted: May 22, 2025

Decided: May 28, 2025

Before KING, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Calvin Scott Wedington, Appellant Pro Se. David Christian Bornstein, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Calvin Scott Wedington appeals the district court's order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) motion for compassionate release and motions to appoint counsel. 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 Wedington 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. We are also satisfied that the district court did not abuse its discretion in declining to appoint counsel. *See United States v. Legree*, 205 F.3d 724, 729-30 (4th Cir. 2000) (noting that district court has discretion to appoint counsel in proceedings under § 3582(c) if interests of justice so require). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Wedington*, No. 1:82-cr-00086-RDB-1 (D. Md. June 29, 2021).

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