

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6373

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LAWRENCE WAYNE REESE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Alexandria. Rossie David Alston, Jr., District Judge. (1:15-cr-00032-RDA-1)

Submitted: July 20, 2026

Decided: July 31, 2026

Before KING, Circuit Judge, and KEENAN and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Wayne Reese, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Wayne Reese 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 compassionate release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Brown*, 78 F.4th 122, 127 (4th Cir. 2023). Under this standard, “we may only find a district court abused its discretion when it acted arbitrarily or irrationally, failed to consider judicially recognized factors constraining its exercise of discretion, relied on erroneous factual or legal premises, or committed an error of law.” *United States v. Burleigh*, 145 F.4th 541, 548 (4th Cir. 2025) (citation modified).

A “defendant may move for compassionate release after he has fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the [Bureau of Prisons] to bring a motion on his behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant's facility, whichever is earlier.” *United States v. Ferguson*, 55 F.4th 262, 268 (4th Cir. 2022) (citation modified); *see* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). “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.” *Brown*, 78 F.4th at 128 (citation modified).

Limiting our review to the issues raised in Reese's informal brief and associated filings, *see* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014), we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Reese's request for

compassionate release. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Reese*, No. 1:15-cr-00032-RDA-1 (E.D. Va. Apr. 16, 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