

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6454

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DARYL KEITH SILLS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Mark S. Davis, Chief District Judge. (2:20-cr-00002-MSD-DEM-1)

Submitted: August 28, 2025

Decided: September 3, 2025

Before GREGORY, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daryl Keith Sills, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Daryl Keith Sills appeals the district court's orders denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) and 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) motions for sentence reductions. First, we review the denial of compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) 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).

"In analyzing a motion for compassionate release, district courts must determine: (1) whether extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction; and (2) that such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission." *United States v. Malone*, 57 F.4th 167, 173 (4th Cir. 2023). "Only after this analysis may the district court grant the motion if (3) the relevant 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, to the extent they are applicable, favor release." *Id.*

On appeal, Sills challenges the district court's conclusions that he failed to demonstrate extraordinary and compelling reasons for his release. We find no abuse of discretion. The district court addressed all of Sills's arguments that extraordinary and compelling reasons existed for his release and explained why each failed to meet the standard.

Similarly, regarding Sills's § 3582(c)(2) motion, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. The district court explained why Sills did not qualify for a sentence

reduction under Amendment 821, which Sills did not address in his informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. *United States v. Sills*, No. 2:20-cr-00002-MSD-DEM-1 (E.D. Va. Oct. 18, 2024; Mar. 10, 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